Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-154
Friday
9 August 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-154 CONTENTS *9 August 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Future of Soviet Nuclear Potential Viewed *[NOVOYE VREMYA No 30]* 1
Nuclear Disarmament 'Convent' for Moscow *[TASS]* 2
Document on Chemical Weapons Inspection in Poland *[TASS]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Rogov Reflects on Moscow Summit *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 7 Aug]* 4
Fitzwater on Most Favored Nation Status *[IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]* 7
U.S. Missionaries Plan Community in Birobidzhan *[TASS]* 7

China

General Chi Haotian Continues Visit 7
  Moiseyev Remarks *[Moscow International]* 7
  Moiseyev on Military Relations *[Moscow International]* 7
  Military Rapprochement Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Aug]* 8
PRC-SRV Vice Foreign Ministers' Meeting Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 8
PRC Military Attache Hosts Reception *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Aug]* 9
Red Cross To Provide Emergency Aid to China *[TASS]* 9
Commentary Endorses PRC Nuclear Pact Position *[Moscow International]* 9
Commentary on Upcoming PRC-South Korea Meeting *[Moscow International]* 9

Northeast Asia

Inter-Korean Dialogue, Relations Viewed *[PRAVDA 8 Aug]* 10

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze on Direction of ASEAN Relations *[INTERFAX]* 11
Australian Firm Develops Telephone in Kazakhstan *[Moscow TV]* 11

Near East & South Asia

Palestinian Welcomes Soviet Role in Conference *[IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]* 12
Palestinian Envoy Briefing on Conference Issues *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Aug]* 12
Prospects for Restoring Israeli Ties Assessed *[Moscow International]* 12
Jewish Agency "Sokhnut" Opens Leningrad Office *[INTERFAX]* 13
Soviet-Syrian Enterprise Runs Bus Route *[Moscow Radio]* 13
Soyuz Group Urges Promoting Ties With Iraq *[TASS]* 13
Kuwait Envoy on Peace Prospects, USSR Ties *[PRAVDA 3 Aug]* 14
Belonogov Receives Iranian Ambassador 6 Aug *[IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]* 15
Friendship Treaty With India Extended 20 Years *[TASS]* 15
  Further on Extension of Treaty *[TASS]* 15
  Gorbachev Greets Indian Leaders *[Moscow TV]* 15
  Gorbachev Telegram Cited *[TASS]* 15
  Soviet-Indian Statement on Treaty *[TASS]* 16

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary on Nikolayenko Pretoria Visit *[Moscow International]* 16
Meets With Botha *[TASS]* 16

East Europe

Serbian Assembly President Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Aug]* 17

West Europe

Agreement Signed With FRG To Retrain Officers *[IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]* 18

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Air Traffic Controllers Set Strike for 10 August *[TASS]* 19
Pilots Change Strike Plan *[Moscow Radio]* 19
Strike Termed 'Illegal' *[TASS]* 19
KGB Denies Leaking Kryuchkov Speech *[NOVOYE VREMYA No 29]* 19
Source of Leak Argued *[NOVOYE VREMYA No 27]* 20
'Protection of State Secrets' Agency Set Up *[IZVESTIYA 7 Aug]* 21
Polozkov Appointed to Agriculture Post *[Moscow Russian TV]* 22
Academic Warns of Conservative Counterattack *[IZVESTIYA 7 Aug]* 22
Moscow Party Chief on Central Committee Plenum *[Vienna SALTO 9 Aug]* 25
Manayenkov on CPSU's Organizational Tasks *[PRAVDA 6 Aug]* 25
Ogarkov Interviewed on Plenum, CPSU Program *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Aug]* 29
Republic Officials Comment on Union Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 30
Further Remarks on Union Treaty *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Aug]* 34
United Democratic Party Hopefuls' Appeal *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 11 Jul]* 35
AN-74 Awarded Airworthiness Certificate *[TASS]* 37
TASS Reviews 9 Aug Soviet Central Press 37

Economic

Denationalization Law Enters Into Effect 7 Aug *[Moscow International]* 38
Gorbachev Consumer Decree Sets 'Modest' Goals *[IZVESTIYA 6 Aug]* 38
Future of Tengiz-Chevron Oil Deal Assessed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 1 Aug]* 39
Problems Facing Joint Ventures Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]* 41
Democratic Reform Movement Economic Plan Viewed *[DELOVOY MIR 24 Jul]* 42

Agriculture

Nationwide Harvesting Status Reviewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 8 Aug]* 44
'Large-Scale' Grain Reaping Under Way *[Moscow Radio]* 44

Military

Air Force Training, Conditions Criticized *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Aug]* 45
S-300 SAM System 'Superior to its Predecessors' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Aug]* 46

BALTIC REPUBLICS

Estonia

Military Reform, Defense To Be Discussed 12 Aug *[BALTFAX]* 48
Justice Minister on Union Property Status *[BALTFAX]* 48
Official, Chinese Consul Discuss Situation *[INTERFAX]* 48
Further on Zhirinovskiy Visit to Republic *[BALTFAX]* 48
Uniformed Militia Servicemen Patrolling Tallinn *[IZVESTIYA 7 Aug]* 48

Paper on ID Cards, Subscription Price Hikes *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Aug]* 49

Latvia

No 'Serious Differences' With Soviet Officials *[BALTFAX]* 49
Supreme Soviet Approves Security Branch Heads *[Riga Radio]* 49
Law Protection Units Supported by Movement *[Riga International]* 50
Popular Front Wants Volunteers at Border Posts *[BALTFAX]* 50
Parliamentary Minority Factions To Cooperate *[Riga International]* 50
  Further on Planned Joint Cooperation *[Radio Vilnius]* 50

Lithuania

Landsbergis Cited on Relations With Gorbachev *[MOSCOW NEWS No. 28]* 50
Invitation to Economic Meeting Not Received Yet *[BALTFAX]* 51
Center's Declaration on Medininkai Decried *[BALTFAX]* 51
Shield Says KGB, OMON Behind Medininkai Deaths *[BALTFAX]* 51
  More on Shield Inquiry, Allegations *[Vilnius International]* 51
  KGB Statement Denies Shield Claims *[TASS]* 52
Investigation Into Medininkai Tragedy Continues *[BALTFAX]* 52
Paratroops Said Brought 'Secretly' Into Republic *[Vilnius International]* 52
Planned Protest Against Vilnius OMON Assailed *[TASS]* 52
Republic Police Search for Medininkai Witnesses *[BALTFAX]* 52
Vilnius Party Secretaries Protest TV Reports *[PRAVDA 8 Aug]* 53
Decision Adopted To Set Up 'Weapons Fund' *[Radio Vilnius]* 53
  More on 'Stock of Weapons' Decision *[TASS]* 53
  Return of Illegal Weapons Urged *[Vilnius International]* 53
Republic Premier Defends Financial Situation *[BALTFAX]* 53
Deputy Economic Minister on Privatization Plans *[TASS]* 54
Former OMON Member Sentenced for Explosion *[TASS]* 54

RSFSR

Continuing Reportage on Communist Party Plenum 55
  Prokofyev Address Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Aug]* 55
  Antonovich Assails Rutskoy *[Radio Rossii]* 56
  Expulsion of Rutskoy, Lipetskiy Condemned *[INTERFAX]* 56
Communist Party Issues Resolutions at Plenum 56
  On Political Situation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Aug]* 56
  On Democratic Comunists Party *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Aug]* 57
  On Departyization Decree *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Aug]* 58
New Communist Party Leader Kuptsov Interviewed *[PRAVDA 8 Aug]* 58
Yeltsin Concludes Tyumen Oblast Trip 8 Aug 59
  Talks in Siberia Summarized *[TASS]* 59
  No Documents Signed *[TASS]* 60
  Promises Decree *[INTERFAX]* 60
  On Parliament Relations With E. Europe *[INTERFAX]* 61
Yeltsin Receives Appeals on Union Treaty 61
  Democratic Russia *[Radio Rossii]* 61
  'Well-Known' Figures *[Radio Rossii]* 61
Further Reportage on Departyization Decree 61
  Initial Impact Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Aug]* 61
  Tatar Bodies Not Implementing Decree *[Moscow Radio]* 62
  Udmurt Sees Implementation of Decree *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Yeltsin, Silayev on Possible Oil Price Hikes *[INTERFAX]* 62
Democratic Communists of Russia Resolution Cited *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 7 Aug]* 63
Tatar Party Leader on Republic Party Program *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Aug]* 64
TV Reports on Moscow Radioactive Dump *[Moscow Russian TV]* 64
Republic Supreme Court Party Cell Disbands *[IZVESTIYA 7 Aug]* 64
Democrats Readying Protest of Compulsory Service *[INTERFAX]* 65

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Belorussia

Communists Issue Statement on Yeltsin Decree *[Radio Rossii]* 66
Official Appeals for Chernobyl Aid *[Minsk Radio]* 66

Ukraine

Electoral Commission Session Discussed *[Kiev Radio]* 66

Moldova

Republic Population Issues Assessed *[Moscow Russian TV]* 67
People's Front Said To Lose Supporters *[IZVESTIYA 5 Aug]* 67
Government To Stimulate Grain Sales *[Moscow Radio]* 67

CAUCASUS

Georgia

Mass Rally Held by Georgians, Armenians, Russians 69
    Rally Held in Sukhumi *[Tbilisi Radio]* 69
    Rally Urges Soviet Army Patrols *[INTERFAX]* 69
New Minister of Culture Appointed *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 26 Jul]* 69
Legal Expert on Charges Against Ossetian *[MOSCOW NEWS No 29]* 69
Abkhaz Leaders Meet With Public Figures *[Tbilisi Radio]* 70

Armenia

Republic To Complete Weapons Registration *[TASS]* 70
Journalists Briefed on NKAO Situation *[Moscow TV]* 71
'Tension Prevails' in NKAO; Two Armenians Dead *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Representative Appointed to U.S., Canada *[IZVESTIYA 7 Aug]* 71

Azerbaijan

Group Set Up To Improve Ties With Georgia *[Baku Radio]* 71

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

President Nazarbayev To Visit Kyrgyzstan 9 Aug *[INTERFAX]* 73
Alma-Ata Status, Mayoral Office To Be Defined *[IZVESTIYA 6 Aug]* 73
Republic Private Trader's Successful Operations *[Moscow TV]* 73
Newspaper Reports Further on Republic's Pollution *[IZVESTIYA 6 Aug]* 73

Kyrgyzstan

Jurisdiction Over Union Enterprises Takes Effect *[TASS]* 74
Program To Support Entrepreneurship Drafted *[INTERFAX]* 74
Republic Militia Supports Departyization *[INTERFAX]* 74

Turkmenistan

Horizontal Wells Boost Republic Oil Production *[TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 19 Jul]* 74
'Popular Science' Newspaper Debuts in Republic *[TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 24 Jul]* 75

Uzbekistan

Republic Reorganizes Publication of Periodicals *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 25 Jul]* 75
New Environmental Weekly To Be Published *[SOVET OZBEKISTONI 25 Jul]* 75
Outbreak of Typhoid Reported in Bukhara Region *[INTERFAX]* 75

Future of Soviet Nuclear Potential Viewed

PM0808155591 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 30, Jul 91 (signed to press 23 Jul 91) pp 22-23

[By Pavel Bayev, candidate of Historical Sciences under the "Ongoing Debate" rubric: "The Nuclear Trump at the Negotiating Table. Will We Transfer Our Tests to Nevada?"]

[Text] The USSR's nuclear interests can no longer remain "something which is hushed up" and camouflaged by nuclear-free rhetoric. The debate is pressing, and if it had as its introduction the political scientists' considered judgments (for example B. Padyshev's column in the March issue of the journal MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN), then the decisive demand from the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Experimental Physics technocrats brought it back to the mainstream of material and highly rational deductions. An emotional protest from the "Greens" camp or from the Committee for the Defense of Peace should in theory have been the response to the article in NOVOYE VREMYA issue No. 26, but I fear that this would have been a "dialogue of the deaf." In my view what is most dangerous of all in the discussion which has begun is the categorical and monolithic nature of the assessments, and in my analysis I will try to single out the problem's external and internal aspects.

Nuclear Attributes of a "Superpower"

One of the traditional postulates of Soviet foreign policy has been the commitment to noble nuclear-free ideals. Having gained a confidence in tank armies, the Soviet leadership bravely stated that it would never be the first to use nuclear weapons. In going over to the new political thinking, this postulate was developed into a program for a nuclear-free world, and its "author" did not fail to remind us of its successes in his recent Nobel lecture. I would like to refrain from making platitudinous analogies, but this program is something akin to the food program: Good intentions completely compensate for the absolute impossibility of implementing them.

At the moment the strategic situation dictates the need for political reliance on nuclear devices. With the conclusion of the Paris Treaty and the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, the USSR appeared for the first time confronted by the fact of NATO's quantitative and qualitative superiority in all components of military potential. The existence of nuclear weapons evens out this superiority and makes the building of an ideal balance and the removal of obvious imbalances superfluous. I venture to posit that it is just this argument (the nuclear "safety margin") which may play a decisive role in the ratification of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe by the Union parliament. But irrespective of this procedure's result, the effect of nuclear deterrence gives NATO an opportunity to plan reductions significantly lower than the "ceilings" agreed upon in Vienna, and gives us the chance to finally set about implementing the military reform.

This naturally does not signal the necessity to preserve existing nuclear arsenals. During the cold war both sides were drawn into a senseless nuclear technologies race. The North Atlantic alliance unilaterally halted at least its quantitative escalation. But to this day there is no certainty as to whether we have stopped and, to be honest, the nuclear research specialists' article does not increase the certainty. You get the impression that the Union leadership is banking on the start of talks on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe and has been saving up the "bargaining chips" by postponing the most pressing steps in curtailing the nuclear programs. In an attempt to push these talks forward, our propaganda appealed to the dying antinuclear movement in the West, and as a result the momentum was lost and today the future of talks is very unclear.

But this does not mean that the resolution of nuclear questions has come to a hopeless standstill. After the final settlement of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Weapons, the agreed parallel reduction of nonstrategic nuclear forces to minimal levels opens up unique opportunities for cooperation by the "European four." Its aim may not only be a new quality of military stability, but also the coordination of nuclear programs and even the creation of structures for cooperation. Today this still seems like an abstraction but leading Western experts, whom no one would suspect of smug complacency, are discussing options which are no longer for a minimal deterrence but for "deterrence by cooperation." In this way, the nuclear factor may become not a source of conflict and distrust, but an important stabilizing element in the all-European military security structure.

On the way to nuclear cooperation, apart from political problems (see later), two categories of obstacle are evident. First, there is the problem of physically destroying the nuclear munition, and here I would like to hear the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Experimental Physics experts' authoritative opinions, as well as their opinions about the possibility of joint technological programs. Second, there is the absolute secrecy of all information concerning the Soviet nuclear arsenals. NATO specialists say in confidence that they know up to 90 percent of this information (although I cannot discount this being a bluff), but a new level of openness and trust is necessary with regard to one's partners and to public opinion at home.

If we succeed in resolving these questions and a nuclear structure in Europe based on cooperation begins to be formed, we can suppose that it will, to an ever greater extent, reorient itself to repulse challenges from outside. The Gulf war with its nuclear and chemical subtext forces one to take these challenges completely seriously. And here the threat from the south may become even more dangerous for the USSR than for the West, even though we do not need the Near East's oil. The Union's borders are becoming all the more penetrable to national, religious, and other sources of instability, and the vulnerability of our southern "underbelly" is becoming greater before our very eyes. It is difficult to predict whether nuclear weapons will be a stabilizing factor here, but such a function cannot be altogether ruled out.

In this way the usefulness of nuclear weapons to the USSR in this transitional period between it being a militarized superpower and a partner on equal terms is beyond question. But guarantees of external security also have a negative aspect—the risk of internal instability.

Control Over the "Button"

The USSR's disintegration is today becoming the most serious nuclear threat to Europe. The defense minister's categorical statements that "under no circumstances will nuclear weapons be allowed to become split up" is hardly capable of reassuring anybody. And also the attempts to stimulate Western assistance for perestroyka by means of downright nuclear blackmail (Russian nuclear revolt!) are for the moment producing results opposite to those desired. The possibility of losing control over the nuclear "button" is considered to be so serious that many people in the West are beginning to practically regard the Soviet idea of a nuclear-free Europe as the lesser of two evils.

Not being in possession of A. Kabakov's talent, I would not like to get into apocalyptic scenarios of several nuclear quasi-states arising from the USSR's ruins, hostile to each other and to the whole world. At the same time, it is clear that it is impossible to preserve the Union in its previous form and composition, and that the "nine plus one" formula gives only a chance of a resolution. And if the independent Baltic republics' nuclear-free status can be guaranteed, it is necessary to urgently resolve the problem of creating nuclear-free zones in the Transcaucasus and indeed in Central Asia.

The "sovereign" republics' claims to control their own nuclear potential for the moment can still be rejected, but are we ready to repulse the threat of nuclear terrorism? A series of tragic accidents with the most up-to-date weapons systems point to the high probability of a "military Chernobyl," and it is impossible to reduce it to an acceptable level in a nonprofessional army. Add to this the immutable fact that the Army today has become the basic source of arms for any "voluntary" formations, mafia-like groupings, and so on. No extraordinary protective measures can close off the channels by which nuclear warheads may be misappropriated or seized, especially when they are being evacuated from hotbeds of tension.

The situation may only be defused by immediate and far-reaching reductions, primarily of nonstrategic systems (nuclear shells, mines, mobile tactical missiles) which will be the most attractive targets for terrorists. And we should in principle be prepared for the possible eventuality of it becoming necessary to put our nuclear facilities under international control, if we lose control over the situation.

Are the arguments in favor of preserving the nuclear status compatible with the alarmist assessments of the risk involved? I think that they are not mutually exclusive—on the condition of there being a realistic and responsible approach to adopting decisions on nuclear matters.

One of the most difficult will be resolving the question of tests, which, it seems, worry the three researchers most of all. This question comes at the juncture of external and internal problems. Tests on Novaya Zemlya are not acceptable even to Europe—remember the painful reaction to last year's discharges and the Greenpeace ship's mission. The tests in Semipalatinsk are unacceptable to Kazakhstan. So, could we transfer our tests to Nevada?

Nuclear Disarmament 'Convent' for Moscow

LD0808174191 Moscow TASS in English 1518 GMT 8 Aug 91

[By Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS—To discuss the socio-political situation in the Helsinki region following radical changes of recent times, to elaborate fresh approaches to problems in the framework of European integration processes, these tasks will be discussed by participants in the 10th Convent for Nuclear Disarmament to be held for the first time in Moscow.

A TASS correspondent was told at the forum organising committee that active members of independent anti-war, human rights, ecological and humanitarian movements, as well as representatives of socialist, liberal and Greens parties of the West will gather in the Soviet capital between August 14-17.

Among those invited to the forum are Maj. Britt Theorin, one of the leaders of Swedish Social Democrats, Swedish ambassador at disarmament conference, Ken Coates, chairman of the Human Rights Committee of the European Parliament, Bruce Kent and Edward Thompson, leaders of Britain's anti-war movement.

Organisers regard the 10th Convent for European Nuclear Disarmament as a new contribution to the elaboration of the principles of new political thinking, tackling problems of comprehensive observance of human rights. One of the central places in the political programme of the convent is occupied by issues of inter-ethnic conflicts and ways to settle them, problems of refugees and emigration.

The forum is also expected to focus on ecology and economic demilitarisation. Another salient feature of the convent is that new Soviet mass organisations and movements, which have emerged in the years of perestroyka, take part in preparations for it. These include the coalition "Civic Peace", Society "Memorial", the Social Democratic Party of Russia, the association "Let's Save the World and Nature", and the all-Union Writers' Association "April".

Document on Chemical Weapons Inspection in Poland

LD0808190491 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 8 Aug 91

[By Sergey Sedov]

[Text] Geneva August 8 TASS—A joint Soviet-Polish document was submitted today to a regular session of the conference of disarmament under way here. The document sums up the results of an experimental challenge inspection conducted on April 17-18, 1991, at Soviet military facilities on the Polish territory. The purpose of the inspection was to establish if there is a possibility of the manufacture of chemical weapons or their components at those facilities.

The presentation of the document was timed for the beginning of a profound and thorough discussion at the conference of the controversial concept of a challenge inspection of various enterprises and facilities. There are suggestions that the concept become one of the main elements of the future mechanism for verification of a comprehensive convention on banning and elimination of chemical weapons which is being drafted at present.

The main purpose of the experimental challenge inspection of military facilities in Poland was to confirm statements of the USSR that there are no chemical weapons of the Soviet make outside the Soviet territory.

In addition, procedures of conducting such inspections were tried out in practice. These procedures are being worked out at the negotiations on banning chemical weapons. The volume of activity for groups of inspectors to be carried out in future at other facilities has been determined, and international inspectors have undergone training.

The participants in the conference on disarmament showed considerable interest in the joint Soviet-Polish document.

United States & Canada

Rogov Reflects on Moscow Summit

91UF1047A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 31, 7 Aug 91 pp 1, 4

[Article by Sergey Rogov, doctor of historical sciences: "The USSR and the United States: Partners in a Multipolar World? Reflections After the Moscow Summit"]

[Text] It would seem that President Bush's visit to Moscow is taking place within the framework of the usual ideas about Soviet-American summit meetings. The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, proclaimed as historical, has been signed. A number of steps have been taken in the economic field that remove some of the obstacles to trade and economic cooperation. All of this is enough to state that, by the traditional criteria, the Moscow summit is a success.

But I would not be in a hurry to reach that conclusion. For whereas during the cold war years any step aimed at reducing Soviet-American tension undoubtedly was of positive significance, today this, in my view, is not enough.

Previously the maximum that could be achieved in top-level diplomacy was limited by the ideological confrontation ("who will bury whom?"), mutual denials, and delegitimation of the two systems. Accordingly, the aim of the leaders of the United States and the USSR was merely to reach agreement on such "rules of the game" as would make the rivalry between the two "superpowers" more predictable and less costly, so that the confrontation would not get out of control and lead to mutual catastrophe.

Now the cold war is a thing of the past and in relations between the USSR and the United States, instead of ideological dogmas, the real interests of the two powers are being moved to the forefront. It is precisely these mutual relations that define a new model for Soviet-American relations. Among the state interests, economic interests connected with demand in both the domestic and the international markets were and remain a priority.

The ideological conflict led to the militarization of economic cooperation between the USSR and the United States. Military force became the measure of power for the "superpowers" in their global confrontation. And the administrative command system, economic boycott notwithstanding, did cope not badly with the organization of the arms race. We were able to reach parity not only in the nuclear sphere but also in conventional weapons, and not only with respect to the United States, but also West Europe, China, and Japan, that is, with all the other power centers in the world arena.

But for us the price of parity was too high. For over the course of at least two generations we lived under the conditions of a wartime economy (in 1991 the proportion of spending in the Union budget is 36 percent, almost the same as in 1941). The Soviet military-industrial complex produced as many weapons (missiles, tanks, guns, warplanes) as were made throughout the rest of the world. We were behind only in naval forces, although we did create the world's second largest navy after the American Navy.

The result is well known: Our society was unable to withstand that great pressure. The steady decline in the living standard, the inability to meet minimum consumer requirements, and the progressive lagging in the technological sphere brought our economy to the brink of collapse. Today we remain a "superpower" only on the plane of the gigantic arsenals of nuclear, chemical, and conventional weapons. But this excessive military might in no way gives us prestige in international affairs. It is clear that alone we cannot maintain military balance with all the major participants in international relations. We must achieve PARTNERSHIP with the key centers of power. This will enable the USSR to preserve its important role in world politics.

The United States, too, has paid no small price for the arms race, although it spends on defense not 25 percent of GNP, as we do, but about 10 percent, and now five percent. Militarized priorities in the economy have led to a situation in which the United States has lost many of its leading positions in the world market, and even more because out of purely ideological considerations ("containing communism") with its own hands it helped competitors to their feet—Germany (which spends three percent of GNP on defense) and Japan (just one percent).

The end of the cold war signifies also an end to the bipolar system of relations. The disappearance of the "socialist community" is only one side of the coin. The other side is less dramatic, but the fundamental loss by the United States of the role of the one and only leader of the West.

True, it has recently been reasoned, particularly since the Persian Gulf war, that Washington has become the "only superpower." But here they forget to say that for the first time since the American War of Independence the cost of this expedition was paid for completely by the allies of the United States—Japan and Germany, and also Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

In fact, a new multipolar system of international relations is being formed. And there are still no guarantees that a multipolar world will be more secure than the bipolar world. For the most terrible world wars in the history of mankind occurred precisely when a multipolar structure existed in international relations. Iraq's aggression against Kuwait was merely a portent of the cataclysms that may occur if there is no new system of international security to replace the nuclear discipline of the cold war.

The main task for the present period is to organize an orderly transition from a bipolar to a multipolar structure in international relations in order to guarantee that the process is peaceful and stable. The dilemma lies in how to encourage the necessary political changes without upsetting military-strategic stability, and how to strengthen stability without blocking political changes.

It is obvious that in the foreseeable future our country's restructuring and the restoration of the economy will be of priority importance for us. Moreover, movement of the Soviet Union out of crisis is largely linked to overcoming international isolation and integrating our country in the world economy. Cooperation with the United States and the other developed states of the West will obviously be essential in solving both short-term tasks (for example, those relating to shortages of food, medicines, and so forth) and long-term tasks (the structural reorganization of the economy). It is becoming clear that for the Soviet Union, maintaining its positions in the international arena during the 1990's will depend largely on its ability to establish nonconfrontational cooperation with the United States.

In turn, they are beginning to understand in America the strategic importance of relations with the USSR for the building of the new world order. It would seem that the Americans should take advantage of our domestic crisis in order to consign us (as Reagan once promised) to the "trash can of history." Instead of that, when he was in Moscow Bush called for an "outline of prospects for the development of Soviet-American relations built not on military confrontation but on economic cooperation, and cooperation in the field of security."

It is, therefore, a dangerous anachronism to regard ideas about the ineluctably confrontational nature of our relations with the United States and the West in general. With the end of the ideological confrontation it has become clear that the degree of divergence in the interests of the USSR and the United States is not all that great.

However, the powerful military-industrial complexes are being preserved, along with excessive armed forces and the traditional ideas about the methods of military force to ensure security. In this regard, not only the United States but we also are displaying an inconsistency that is leading to loss of tempo and complicating consolidation of the positive changes in the international arena. Obviously, the unilateral actions that led to the unjustified delay in ratification of the treaty on conventional arms reductions should not be repeated. It would also be a mistake not to note the significant reductions in the military budget and armed forces of the United States and the re-orientation of the American war machine away from preparations for global confrontation with the USSR and toward low-intensity conflicts in the "third world."

The mistakes in accomplishing the conversion of the defense industry are also exerting a negative influence, as is the growth in the proportion of military spending in the Union budget. This is not only hampering us in achieving an economic return from arms reduction agreements but also preventing the organization of closer cooperation with the West in solving the strategic task of integrating the USSR into the world economy. There can be no doubt that without change in the approach to this problem we will be unable to count on receiving large-scale economic and technical assistance from the West.

The old mechanisms for ensuring security, both national and at the interstate level, are today ineffective. The Warsaw Pact has therefore disappeared, and NATO is trying urgently to find a new meaning for its existence. Moreover, even achievements in arms control negotiations, such as the INF treaty and the treaty on reduction of conventional armed forces and armanents in Europe, and the treaty on limitation and reduction of strategic offensive arms, which has just been signed, are no longer adequate. For their purpose was to achieve "ideal parity," a mirror-image equality of the forces of those engaged in military confrontation. But now, when the main reason for that kind of confrontation has been removed, these agreements to some degree preserve the earlier model of confrontation by promoting retention of the stereotype of "the enemy."

Of course, START was necessary and essential for both sides. Whereas the 1972 agreement on reducing offensive strategic arms (SALT-1) only established limits for increases in the numbers of strategic missiles but did not establish limits for nuclear warheads, and the SALT-2 agreement, signed in 1979 but not ratified, reduced the number of delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons by 5-10 percent, the new treaty reduces the strategic arsenals of the USSR and the United States targeted one against the other by 30-35 percent.

On the whole the treaty makes it possible to maintain strategic stability by preserving the situation of "mutual assured destruction" into the 1990's. But it does not block modernization, and it virtually encourages the sides to build up the aviation component of the strategic offensive triad. This may "eat up" the savings from the cutbacks (a B-2 bomber costs more than $800 million, and how much does a Tu-160 cost?). Competition will probably also grow in the sphere of strategic defense, not only and not so much in the development of ABM's but also the development of air defenses, and also antiship weapons.

I think that this is the crux of the problem that the USSR and the United States face today. The legal principle of "everything that is not forbidden is permitted" makes sense in domestic affairs, but not in the strategic sphere. Meanwhile, even with the entire unprecedented system of checks envisaged by the START treaty, many methods for continuing the arms race remain open.

This also explains the lack of enthusiasm about START among the experts, for it reflects the old model of verification of arms as a method for jointly making decisions in the sphere of security. This kind of model to regulate military competition gives the sides freedom of action within established frameworks, and in the absence of coordination stimulates the vicious circle of "action and reaction."

In fact, the historical task facing the two countries goes far beyond the framework of regulating confrontation. Continuation of military rivalry under conditions in which American military spending this year equals the federal budget deficit, while here it seems that the situation will be even worse, is not simply senseless but becomes a major threat to the vitally important interests of the USSR and the United States. M.S. Gorbachev, therefore, has invited America to a "fundamental transformation of our mutual relations for the sake of universal peace, stability, and progress."

Together with the dismantling of the legacy of the cold war it is necessary to achieve the institutionalization of the positive process in the world arena as quickly as possible. To resolve this task what is needed is a mechanism of mutual security for the USSR and the United States as an integral part of new universal system of international security now taking shape. The mechanism of mutual security should include a system of joint bodies constantly to agree the diplomatic, military, and economic positions of the two states in all matters affecting their interests.

The functions of this mechanism should not be limited to negotiating for the purpose of signing specific agreements, but should include permanent dialogue to ensure that decisions reached by the leadership of the two countries are made giving due consideration to each other's interests both through officially recorded agreements and coordination of actions without the formal conclusion of treaties.

It is a question of switching from "negative" to "positive" decisionmaking in the sphere of security. It is time to understand that there is no such thing as an ideal treaty, but there is a process that requires close cooperation at the political and military levels. Obviously the new character of Soviet-American relations and the presence of parallel and joint interests in the field of security make it possible to pose the question of switching to "positive" joint decisionmaking. It is essential to lay the cards on the table, exchanging with the other side the long-term plans for military development, including the deployment of strategic forces.

A standing consultative commission, negotiating institutions for strategic and space weapons, bodies to verify the INF Treaty, a center to reduce the nuclear danger, and other common institutions should become integral components of such a system. However, in terms both of the composition of the instruments and of their aggregate quality, the mechanism of mutual security should be set at a level higher than the present level of Soviet-American cooperation. It is obviously necessary to consider the question of setting up on a permanent basis bodies such as a committee of foreign and defense ministers and a commission to maintain communication between the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces and the U.S. chiefs of staff.

The mechanism of mutual security for the USSR and the United States requires an unprecedented level of glasnost and openness between them, including in the military sphere. A regime of transparency is needed, which should be backed not only by a system of reliable verification, including on-site monitoring and inspection, but also by the adoption of standards of openness in military activity. This degree of glasnost and openness in the military sphere, if, moreover, it is guaranteed by the ruble and the dollar and by the Supreme Soviet and the Congress, will help in resolving the question of intentions and combat possibilities not only today but also tomorrow. This kind of approach will make relations between the two powers more predictable than will the most stringent methods to verify treaties of "prohibition."

In order to ensure predictability and irreversibility in the matter of dismantling the mechanism of military confrontation between the USSR and the United States, the process of parallel arms reductions should be augmented by a process of dismantling the economic foundation for the arms race. Agreement on efforts in this matter, and joint technical solutions will provide the best guarantee that there will be no quick return to confrontation.

It is advisable to set up a joint Soviet-American commission on conversion that could coordinate the efforts of the two countries in solving similar management, technological, and social problems. The creation of a international conversion bank with the participation of the USSR, the United States, and other major states is also possible. This bank could provide credit for the larger expenditures that the re-orientation of some enterprises will require, or spending to retrain the work force at plants that simply have to be closed down. Perhaps joint-venture enterprises could also be set up with support from this bank.

Extensive cooperation is also necessary to restrict trade in weapons and military equipment, including nonproliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons and technologies for ballistic and cruise missiles. Agreements reached with the United States in this sphere could become the prototypes for international agreements on these issues. Neither should we exclude re-orientation of the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls and setting up a new international organization to monitor deliveries of weapons and military technology to the developing countries. This would be of great importance for the development of Soviet-American cooperation with respect to regional conflicts in the "third" world.

If the Moscow summit is followed by real steps to institutionalize the new partnership between the USSR and the United States, then this top-level meeting really will go down in history as a key event in creation of the new world order.

Fitzwater on Most Favored Nation Status

PM0808104891 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, IAN, AP roundup: "U.S. Congress Has the Last Word"]

[Text] The White House has issued a statement by the U.S. President's Press Secretary M. Fitzwater. It contains a clarification of G. Bush's decision to submit for the approval of the U.S. Congress a Soviet-American trade agreement providing for the granting of most-favored-nation status in trade.

M. Fitzwater stated that "the trade agreement in no way changes the long-standing U.S. policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the USSR and our support for their legitimate rights. The administration has adopted a decision to accompany the granting of most-favored-nation status to the USSR with special provisions for the Baltic states. First, for the purposes of trade statistics, we will keep separate accounts of Baltic goods. Second, we will also grant technical assistance to the Baltic governments in developing trade and exports with a view to improving our trade relations with them."

U.S. Missionaries Plan Community in Birobidzhan

LD0808132691 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 8 Aug 91

[By correspondent Viktor Gorelov]

[Text] Birobidzhan August 8 TASS—A group of missionaries from California is visiting Birobidzhan, the centre of the Jewish autonomous region in the Soviet Far East.

They will familiarise themselves with the religious life in the region and consider prospects for setting up a community of Baha'ullah's followers and opening a church. Their preaching in city streets attracted many people.

The Baha'ullah religious movement emerged in the middle of the 19th century in Iran. It has now many followers all over the world. The religion is based on three main principles: the unity of God, the unity of religions, the unity of the whole mankind and the creation on their basis of a universal language.

There are a Jewish synagogue and Baptist and Orthodox churches in the city.

China

General Chi Haotian Continues Visit

Moiseyev Remarks

OW0808212491 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1000 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Commentary by station observer Kozlov; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Listeners, General Chi Haotian, chief of general staff of the Chinese People's Liberation Army [PLA], is currently visiting the Soviet Union. According to Kozlov, our station observer, the visit is yet more proof of the rapid development of military contacts between the Soviet Union and China.

Kozlov says: These days it seems like the ideological and military confrontations existing between our two countries for as long as 30 years never happened. Over a very short period, our two countries have exchanged visits of dozens of high-ranking military delegations. Soviet Defense Minister Yazov recently visited China, and now the chief of the Chinese PLA General Staff is visiting Moscow.

According to General Moiseyev, chief of general staff of the Soviet armed forces, Soviet military authorities have seriously reviewed the characteristics of the difficult times of our two armed forces. He says: As one born and enlisted in the Far East, I can truly say that we never adopted a hostile attitude toward the China on the other side of the Amur River. That was because we and the Chinese people were friendly toward one another for a long time. Now the days that divided the peoples and armed forces of our two countries are over, and the traditional good-neighborliness has been reinstated. Today, major changes have taken place in Europe. The changes can be said to be very important. Reduced danger of war in Europe has provided the basis for creating a collective security system. In Asia, the process in this respect, especially our relations with China, is equally important. China has enormous economic strength and enormous manpower.

The chief of general staff of the Soviet armed forces says he is satisfied with the development of relations between the USSR and China in the military sphere, progress achieved in their dialogues for easing the border situation, and the exchange of views concerning modern military construction and military reform. He says he is convinced that General Chi Haotian's current visit to the USSR will expedite this process.

Moiseyev on Military Relations

LD0808144991 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] The chief of the staff of China's Armed Forces, General Chi Haotian, is paying a visit to the Soviet Union. Radio Moscow observer Sergey Kozlov regards this as yet another indication of dynamic military contacts between the two countries.

It's as if there'd been no three decades of ideological and even military confrontation between the Soviet Union and China. Over a brief spell, the two countries have exchanged more than a dozen military delegations at ever higher level and just recently China was visited by the Soviet Defense Minister, Marshal Yazov, and now the chief of staff of China's Armed Forces, Gen. Chi Haotian, is in Moscow.

The Soviet military have resolutely turned from the difficult period in relations between the two armies. The chief of staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, General Mikhail Moiseyev, has remarked in an interview: As I was born in the Far East and served there, I frankly say that we never regarded the Chinese bank of the Amur river as hostile, Gen. Moiseyev said, for living there are the people with whom we've been friends for ages. The years that separated our nations and our armed forces have gone. We return to the good traditions that have always been between the neighbors. This is all the more urgent today, since significant changes have taken place in Europe. The danger of war has diminished and a collective security system has shaped up. Such a process is no less important in Asia. This particularly concerns our relations with China, a country with tremendous economic and work-force potential.

Gen. Moiseyev voiced satisfaction with how bilateral relations have been developing in the military field. He described a dialogue on easing tension along the common border as successful and welcomed the exchange of experience in military advancement and reforms.

Gen. Moiseyev voiced confidence that this process would receive a fresh impetus from the current visit to the Soviet Union by the chief of staff of China's Armed Forces, Gen. Chi Haotian.

Military Rapprochement Viewed

PM0808092791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 91 p 3

[Report by A. Platkovskiy: "Don't Rouse the 'Paper Tiger'"]

[Text] Friendly contacts between Chinese and USSR high-ranking military officials are growing stronger. Colonel General Chi Haotian, chief of the General Staff of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, is paying an official visit to Moscow. Marshal D. Yazov visited Beijing last May.

It is of course very good that our dealings with China are normalizing in the military sphere. Generals can achieve even more than diplomats through friendly meetings.

Nevertheless contacts between the Soviet and Chinese military have for some time been subject to close attention. It is easy to surmise that they cannot help but worry those who have grown accustomed to the murmur of the "two-headed Asian dragon" since the fifties. The specter of a "Sino-Soviet alliance" still seems alive and capable of inspiring fear. That was why the West greeted with such concern the reports on deals that are being prepared to supply China with Soviet military hardware.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA said that D. Yazov and Chi Haotian had a conversation in a warm and friendly atmosphere. According to reports from informational circles, the two sides collated their assessments with the present military-strategic situation. They think that their views are growing closer still due to the special role that the United States is increasingly assuming in the world following its triumph in the Persian Gulf. While in Beijing D. Yazov said during one interview that "troops may still come in handy" since "attempts are being made" (the reference being to the United States—A.P.) to exploit conflicts for gain. The Chinese top brass' position is even more transparent: Imperialist circles have not abandoned their strong-arm policy and are trying to put pressure on socialism.

Having revised the well-known idea that "imperialism is a paper tiger," Chinese military strategists believe that the world has changed little and "power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

PRC-SRV Vice Foreign Ministers' Meeting Noted

OW0808010391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1400 GMT 7 Aug 91

[Commentary by Nikolayev; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] On 8-10 August, a talk between China and Vietnam at the vice foreign ministerial level will be held in Beijing. They will discuss the question of mediating the situation in Cambodia and the development of Sino-Vietnamese relations. Station commentator Nikolayev has the following comments:

Today, it is obvious that progress has been made in this respect. As for the Cambodian issue, it is no longer hampering the normalization of Sino-Vietnamese relations. However, this does not mean that Hanoi and Beijing take completely the same stand on the above-mentioned issue. Of course, both sides still hold some different points of view, but the situation is no longer the same as it was in the recent past. This is the result of actions taken by the two countries to mediate the situation in Cambodia. In order to mediate that situation, not only China and Cambodia, but also other countries involved in the Cambodian conflict have had to adopt compromise actions toward each other.

As for Sino-Vietnamese bilateral relations, the two countries are now gradually restoring traditional friendly and good-neighborly relations. This is indicated by the well-meaning actions taken mutually by Beijing and Hanoi recently. For instance, Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China [CPC], sent a congratulatory cable to Do Muoi, who became the leader of the Vietnamese Communists not long ago. Observers have noticed that Beijing extended congratulations to Do Muoi at a time when Beijing and Hanoi had not yet restored their inter-party relations. It should be pointed out that in September last year, a high-ranking Vietnamese leader made a formal visit to China's capital despite the above-mentioned situation. Some observers hold that this event indicates that Sino-Vietnamese relations have actually been normalized. Later, the foreign press repeatedly reported other Vietnamese party and political activists had informally visited China.

The last talk between China and Vietnam at the vice foreign ministerial level was held more than two years ago. Since then, the two countries have continued a dialogue. It should be pointed out that during these years, bilateral trade relations have also developed remarkably. It is estimated that the new Sino-Vietnamese bilateral talks to open in Beijing on Thursday will become another step in promoting the improvement of relations between the two neighboring countries and improve the political situation in that region.

PRC Military Attache Hosts Reception

PM0808135591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Aug 91 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "On Occasion of Anniversary"]

[Text] On 1 August Major General Ning Wenyan, the Army, Navy, and Air Force attache to the PRC Embassy in the USSR, held a reception on the occasion of the 64th anniversary of the formation of the Chinese People's Liberation Army.

Attending the reception were USSR Minister of Defense Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov and other military and state leaders, generals, admirals, and officers of the USSR Armed Forces, and representatives of the capital's public.

Also present at the reception was Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR. Among the guests were military attaches to the embassies of foreign states in the USSR.

USSR Minister of Defense Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov warmly congratulated representatives of the PRC Armed Forces on their holiday, and wished them further success in ensuring their country's security.

Red Cross To Provide Emergency Aid to China

LD0908093291 Moscow TASS in English 0842 GMT 9 Aug 91

[By correspondent Gei Petukhov]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—The Russian Government and the Russian Red Cross Society decided to extend emergency humanitarian aid to flood-hit China.

Yuriy Zapadalov, deputy chairman of the Russian Red Cross Society Central Committee, told TASS that Aeroflot planes will ferry blankets, tents and emergency aid ambulances to China. The cost of cargoes sent to China and the spending on transportation will amount to several million rubles.

Commentary Endorses PRC Nuclear Pact Position

OW0808212591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1400 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Commentary by Alekseyev]

[Text] Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu is scheduled to pay an official visit to China on 10 August. Among the issues he will discuss with Chinese leaders will be that of nuclear nonproliferation. According to KYODO, the prime minister will propose that China sign this international treaty at an early date. In this connection, station observer Alekseyev writes:

The issue of China's signing the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty has in fact been resolved. During his visit to Japan last June, Chinese Foreign Affairs Minister Qian Qichen made it clear that China would sign the treaty very soon.

Since 1968, when this treaty was initialled, 118 countries have signed it, providing broad support for this international law. Subsequently, this treaty has become an important factor contributing to reduction of the nuclear threat. The Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain have undertaken the responsibilities of being the guarantors [bao zheng guo] of this treaty.

China became a nuclear power in 1968, but it did not sign the treaty. Now, after 23 years, there is perhaps no need for us to explore why Beijing adopted that attitude, but we want to mention here that China was then being swept by the torrents of the Cultural Revolution. China's position then was vastly different from its current position. China's position toward nuclear nonproliferation is in line with its responsible position of opposing nuclear threats. For example, Beijing unconditionally endorses the Soviet- U.S. treaty for reducing medium-range missiles and reducing strategic weapons by one-third. Now the nuclear nonproliferation treaty has again become a priority. Experiences gained over the years show that the terms prescribed in the 1968 treaty are apparently not sufficient. There are loopholes through which certain countries can acquire nuclear weapons, or the technology and materials for producing nuclear weapons, from nuclear powers. The Gulf War [words indistinct] the international community. How dangerous the situation was!

In short, the issue of nuclear nonproliferation has become especially acute. China's firm position on this issue will certainly facilitate its [word indistinct] settlement.

Commentary on Upcoming PRC-South Korea Meeting

OW0808130891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 2200 GMT 6 Aug 91

[By station commentator (Bukov); from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] In their upcoming continued talks in Beijing in mid-August, representatives of China and South Korea will discuss the signing of a series of bilateral economic agreements. Station commentator (Bukov) has the following comments:

Talks [between China and South Korea] aimed at leading to the signing of a trade agreement, the guarantee for investment, and the avoidance of double taxation have been going on for several months. The continued development of economic connections between the two countries warrants the establishment of a legal basis for economic cooperation at the present stage. As the trade volume between the two countries last year exceeded $3.5 billion in the absence of diplomatic ties, it has been South Korea's important diplomatic task to establish normal relations with China. However, Seoul realizes that Beijing does not favor a hurried exchange of missions because of the latter's traditionally close relations with Pyongyang. Seoul also realizes that Pyongyang is still very sensitive to Seoul's degree of diplomacy towards the North. In spite of all this, economic, cultural, and sports relations between China and South Korea have been developing smoothly. Taking into consideration of the ever-enhancing political influences of the two countries and the continued changes in situation on the Korean peninsula, it is quite certain that the lack of of diplomatic relations between China and South Korea is temporary. I think Pyongyang has also got the point. Its recent increasingly realistic comments on changing the world situation seem that it has reacted not unsuccessfully in correspondence to the challenges of time. The announcement by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for UN membership application and its continued talks with the International Atomic Energy Agency on questions of inspecting its nuclear installations should serve as evidence.

As maintained by many observers, in taking such moves, the DPRK has been under the influence of China to a substantial extent. Although Beijing generally does not comment openly in response to such remarks, it is very obvious that China is very interested in seeing a stabilized Korean peninsula and developing relations with both South and North Korea. Understandably, Beijing must be cautious in carrying out such concrete diplomatic moves, including its attitude towards Seoul. Apparently, different views did exist between the two countries on the development of relations. Not long ago, a South Korean foreign ministry spokesman said: We are not in a hurry to improve relations with China but prepare to proceed gradually towards this direction by laying more emphasis on practical cooperation. It appears that Beijing is satisfied with this. Questions on enlarging such practical cooperation will be discussed in the upcoming August meeting in Beijing.

Northeast Asia

Inter-Korean Dialogue, Relations Viewed

PM0808132591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Second Edition p 5

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "Viewpoint": "When Will The Ice Start To Break?"]

[Text] The ROK has officially applied to join the United Nations. Pyongyang made a similar request a month before Seoul. In August the Security Council intends to make the necessary recommendations to both North and South so that this question can be submitted to the scheduled General Assembly session in September.

The two Korean states joining the United Nations at the same time is the result of flexibility on the part of Pyongyang, which has displayed willingness to compromise. This sensible step will undoubtedly boost the DPRK's international prestige and enable it to normalize relations with the United States and Japan. Seoul, for its part, wants to exchange ambassadors with Beijing a little sooner. Both states' ties with the leading powers in the region will then take on a legal footing. I am sure that North and South Korea's membership of the international community will facilitate the country's reunification and, in the first place, help to turn the Korean Peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

This part of Northeast Asia has proved a kind of "cold war" preserve. Confrontational rhetoric has tinged the dialogue between Pyongyang and Seoul for a long time, sometimes causing it to resemble a conversation between deaf people. But the winds of change reaching Asia are beginning to smash the ice of alienation even here. The immobility of deadlock is giving way to a quest for points of contact.

While being a party to the Nuclear nonproliferation treaty, the DPRK for a long time did not agree to admit International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] inspectors, linking this with its demand for the removal of U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea. But the possibility of a compromise has begun to emerge even here.

The DPRK Government recently issued a solemn statement that it is ready to take all steps needed to turn the Korean Peninsula into a nuclear-free zone. In conditions when the largest nuclear powers—the USSR and the United States—are moving away from confrontation to dialogue, the statement says, a new objective opportunity has emerged for this. The intention is to sign a joint declaration by the end of 1992, in which both states would pledge not to produce, acquire, site, or test nuclear weapons and to hold the requisite inspections in this connection in North and South. The United States, the Soviet Union, and China have been urged to guarantee the status of the nuclear-free zone and "eliminate all elements contravening this" within the year.

It is worth noting that the current Pyongyang initiative has met with a more constructive response from Seoul than was previously the case. It has been said that if North Korea admits an IAEA international inspection team to its nuclear installations, South Korea will be willing to discuss the question of turning the peninsula into a nuclear-free zone.

In the opinion of Japan's NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN, the change in Seoul's stance has been brought about by the increase in antinuclear sentiments in the world, and in particular the signing of the Soviet-U.S. strategic offensive arms treaty. What is more, on the eve of the two Korean states' joining the United Nations, the South has to manifest flexibility in return for the North's flexibility. Reports have circulated in Seoul that President No Tae-u intends to raise the question of the withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea in his speech at the UN General Assembly session.

August always plays an important role in inter-Korean dialogue. The fourth round of North-South talks at prime minister level are to be held at the end of this month. The heads of the two governments met late last year, after which Pyongyang broke off all contacts with Seoul in protest at the joint U.S.-ROK "Team Spirit" maneuvers. For the second year voices have been heard in both parts of the divided country calling for Korean Liberation Day—15 August—to be celebrated together. However, the rhetoric of the propaganda war is preventing what are effectively similar functions—designed to demonstrate the nation's desire for unity—from being combined. Things are often spoilt because neither side wants to give up the role of organizer to the other.

Nonetheless the changes in the world and regional climate are increasingly having an impact on the Korean Peninsula too. The first cracks have split the icy "cold war" shroud and the first signs of progress have been revealed. May the river of inter-Korean dialogue break free of its restrictive shroud as rapidly as possible!

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze on Direction of ASEAN Relations

OW0708195091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1636 GMT 7 Aug 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Indonesian Ambassador in Moscow Djanwar Djani gave a breakfast in honour of the President of the Soviet Foreign Political Association Eduard Shevardnadze on Wednesday. Seven ambassadors and senior diplomatic representatives of the ASEAN countries were present at the breakfast.

There was detailed, animated talk on the situation in the USSR and in the Asian-Pacific region, on realizing the Soviet initiatives launched by Shevardnadze during the time when he was the Soviet Foreign Minister. In particular on the perspectives of holding a meeting on problems of the Asian-pacific region in Vladivostok in 1993.

The ambassadors invited to the breakfast expressed anxiety that, according to them, the Soviet Union is losing interest in the region. Many questions were asked to E. Shevardnadze about whether this is a change of Soviet position or a temporary occurrence.

The former Foreign Minster's opinion was that it was probably the result of various circumstances but that the general line should not be changed, as it was developed quite well. At the same time Shevardnadze regretfully said that priorities had shifted slightly for the present. He admitted the justice of the critics and said that we had lost the dynamics of developing relations in that direction.

The talk touched upon the recent visit of the Soviet Deputy Prime-Minister J. Maslyukov to Kuala Lumpur in the ASEAN's session. The ambassadors stressed that the leaders of those countries doubted the seriousness of Soviet intentions to develop relations with the countries of that region. The sharpest appreciations of the "Maslyukov's mission" contained the epithet "unsuccessful".

It was stressed at the breakfast that the general impression of the ASEAN countries was that somebody in the USSR hindered normal trade and economic relations, and made difficulties for the enterprises involved in various types of mutual activities.

Australian Firm Develops Telephone in Kazakhstan

OW0608055491 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT 5 Aug 91

[Video Report by P. Fedorov from Australia; from the "Utro" program]

[Text] The number of telephone channels linking Kazakhstan with the outside world will increasse fourfold. This will occur at the end of this year when the Australian state international telecommunications company OTC [Overseas Telecommunications Company] will build an Earth station for satellite telephone and facsimile communications.

[Begin recording] [Fedorov] In my opinion Kazakhstan made the best choice by entrusting the development and modernization of its telephone communications to the Australians. Today OTC has the most modern communications technology at its disposal which links all the continents, and via space maintains contact with ships at sea and aircraft in flight. The equipment, designed for Australian conditions, is most suitable for Kazakhstan. The vast expanses of this republic are similar to those in Australia where there is a severe continental climate. The local equipment is built to withstand the great changes in temperatures. [Video shows ground parabolic antennas, graphics of a communications satellite, and other facilities and computer equipment in Australia]

Another important point in this agreement between Kazakhstan and Australia is that the republic will not have to pay in hard currency. Telephone calls from Western Europe to Asia will be routed over an Earth satellite communications station. Part of the payments of overseas subscribers for these services will be used to defray the loan. [video cuts to show Fedorov talking to

Peter Shore, manager of OTC "International," and translating his remarks into Russian]

[Shore] By the end of the year Kazakhstan will no longer have any difficulties in communicating with the outside world. Businessmen understand how important handy and reliable communications are to conducting business. We decided to begin our business cooperation with the Soviet Union precisely with Kazakhstan because this republic has enormous economic potential and, as we found, it is actively striving for international cooperation. It is also important that we perceive Kazakhstan to be one of the more stable Soviet republics. [end recording]

Near East & South Asia

Palestinian Welcomes Soviet Role in Conference

PM0808110691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by V. Lashkul on press coference given by Palestinian Ambassador Nabil 'Amr in Moscow—date not given: "Palestinian Ambassador's Press Conference"]

[Excerpts] A press conference was given by Nabil 'Amr, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the State of Palestine to the USSR, in the Jerusalem Hall of the Palestinian Cultural Center in Moscow. Soviet and foreign journalists were briefed on the PLO leadership's assessment of the prospects for convening an international conference on the Near East. [passage omitted]

Mentioning the statement by U.S. Secretary of State Baker, who stressed that Tel Aviv does not have a "veto" on the composition of the Palestinian delegation, the ambassador said, in particular: "You cannot talk about any serious peace if the establishment of that peace does not involve participation by the Palestinians represented by the PLO as an equal party and one of the main parties. We are prepared to consult on the question of a formula for participation by the Palestinians in the Washington conference, but we insist firmly that no other party should interfere in the composition of our delegation, whether it is Palestinian, joint Arab, or Jordanian-Palestinian."

Assessing the USSR's role in the Near East settlement process, N. 'Amr stated that in accordance with Soviet-U.S. agreements Moscow is to act as an essential factor for stability and equilibrium at the coming conference. The Soviet Union's participation in it is an important guarantee that the dialogue on peace will be held in a form acceptable to the Palestinians. We believe, the ambassador noted, that the USSR is now capable of playing a far more effective role in achieving a just peace in the Near East than in the days of the cold war.

Palestinian Envoy Briefing on Conference Issues

PM0808153391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Aug 91 First Edition p 5

["Own Information" report under the general heading "Occupation and Ambition. Tel Aviv Impedes PLO Participation in Peace Conference": "Ambassador's Press Conference"]

[Text] Nabil 'Amr, PLO ambassador to the USSR, has held a press conference in Moscow. Addressing journalists, he said in particular:

"We consider deciding the date for a Near East peace conference to be an important step toward a regional settlement. However, there are still serious obstacles in the way. The reason is Israel's policy. It is demanding that the question of the future of Jerusalem be struck off the conference agenda. It clearly intends to continue the practice of setting up its own settlements on the occupied territories. Lastly, Israel has awarded itself a right which it has never been delegated—the right to determine the composition of the Palestinian delegation to be sent to the conference."

"We firmly espouse the idea," Nabil 'Amr stressed, "that no country should interfere in deciding the composition of the Palestinian delegation, regardless of whether it is a separate delegation or whether it is part of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. We will consult with the Arab countries and with the Soviet Union and we would like to have dialogue with the United States, but we will not allow Israeli diktat. Incidentally, Secretary of State Baker said that Israel by no means has the right of veto over the composition of the Palestinian delegation. Israel's position can only be attributed to one thing—reluctance to help establish a true lasting peace in the Near East."

According to the ambassador, the Palestinians are also worried about the increasingly frequent statements regarding the possibility of various interpretations of the UN Security Council resolutions that demand the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied territories. What is more, it is intended that these interpretations will be made the subject of discussion at the peace conference. In Nabil 'Amr's opinion, a concerted USSR and U.S. position could play a positive and extremely important role on this issue.

Prospects for Restoring Israeli Ties Assessed

LD0808134191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 8 AUG 91

[Commentary by Aleksandr Pogodin]

[Text] With further efforts to call a Middle East peace conference, the issue of Moscow and Tel Aviv restoring relations with each other is now the subject of widespread discussions. Commentary is by Aleksandr Pogodin:

Israeli officials even speak of this happening before the regional peace forum and references are being made to the words by the Soviet Foreign Minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, that the issue could come under discussion during his coming tour of the region.

Diplomatic relations between the two countries were broken off in 1967 in response to the Israeli aggression on its Arab neighbors. The Soviet reaction may have been too harsh, but quite justifiable at the time it happened. And yet Moscow has never denied the Israelis' right to existence, peace, and security. As signs have now emerged of some change for the better in the regional climate and chances have opened up for a negotiated settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict, the need for new approaches to the problem is only too apparent. And all the more so because the absence of diplomatic relations between two sovereign states is in principle not quite normal. Soviet experts in international affairs, in their publications of recent time, now and again call for restoring diplomatic relations with Israel immediately.

There are grounds to believe the time isn't far off before the two countries mend their fences, but there is no need to rush things. A Soviet Foreign Ministry official said recently Moscow believes the issue can be resolved only within the framework of negotiations on a comprehensive settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict, which must be taken as the need for resolving the two issues concurrently. Such an approach is more realistic, because it meets the interests of Moscow and Tel Aviv and those of regional peace and stability.

Jewish Agency "Sokhnut" Opens Leningrad Office

OW0808142491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The press-centre of the Leningrad City Council informed about [as received] the fact that the World Jewish Agency "Sokhnut" opened its official office in Leningrad. The leadership of the agency hopes that the Leningrad office will organize the study of the Jewish history, culture and language. The agreement with the city authorities is concluded on setting partner relations between Leningrad and the Israeli capital Tel-Aviv.

Soviet-Syrian Enterprise Runs Bus Route

LD0808101791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0500 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] A regular bus route has come into being, linking Nalchik, the capital of Kabardino-Balkariya, with Turkey and Syria. You can get to Damascus in just three days. That's not as fast as by air, but a lot cheaper. The joint Soviet-Syrian enterprise has set the price of its transport services at 810 rubles or $75, whichever you prefer. The first passengers on the motorized Orient Express include students, businessmen, and inhabitants of the northern Caucasus with relatives abroad.

Soyuz Group Urges Promoting Ties With Iraq

LD0808173791 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 8 Aug 91

[By parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS—The Iraqi people continue to have friendly feelings for Soviet people. Such is the impression of representatives of the Soyuz group of deputies who returned from Iraq the other day. They were staying in Iraq for a week at the invitation of the Iraqi parliament. Soviet MPs [members of parliament] spoke of their impressions at a news conference in Moscow today.

USSR people's deputy Yevgeniy Kogan, head of the delegation, said that Soviet MPs had numerous meetings with officials, business people and ordinary citizens, and that Iraqis emphasised the need to develop contacts with the Soviet side and strengthen cooperation, above all in the economic area.

Kogan said the Soviet Foreign Ministry is not active enough and even shows political shortsightedness when it does little to restore broad ties with Iraq in various areas.

Kogan said that Iraq is prepared to begin repaying its debt to the Soviet Union any moment, for example, with oil. But he said that little interest is shown in Moscow in this aspect which is of no small importance. He said that the Soyuz group intends to question parliament about this.

Reporters were told about negotiations of representatives of the Soyuz group of deputies with a delegation of the national council of Iraq and about a joint statement that was signed.

It is noted in the statement that the Soviet delegation supports the striving of the Iraqi side to resume economic cooperation between the two countries. It seeks to promote a return of Soviet specialists to Iraq to help to restore what was destroyed there during combat operations.

People's deputies of the USSR who addressed the news conference assessed the recent events in Iraq. They asserted that the routing of the Iraqi Army at war is a fable that has nothing in common with reality. They believe that reports about "famine in Iraq" are much exaggerated. "We have not noticed a rift between the Iraqi population and administration," deputies were saying.

Kuwait Envoy on Peace Prospects, USSR Ties

91UF1046A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Aug 91 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with Kuwaiti Ambassador to the USSR 'Abd al-Mohsen Yusef Al-Du'ayj by unidentified PRAVDA correspondent; place and date not given: "The Victim Was Not Only Kuwait"]

[Text] *A year has passed since the tragic day of 2 August, when Iraq perpetrated unprovoked aggression against Kuwait. But it was not only Kuwait that was the victim of the piratical attack. The Iraqi people and peace and stability in the region fell victim to the political ambitions of Baghdad's rulers. And, of course, all people in the world are concerned about how to lower the "temperature" of tension in the Near and Middle East. This was one of the topics discussed during an interview with Mr. 'Abd al-Mohsen Yusef Al-Du'ayj, ambassador of Kuwait in the Soviet Union, which he gave to a PRAVDA correspondent.*

"I agree that the victim of this unprovoked aggression on the part of the Baghdad military regime was not only Kuwait but also the Iraqi people," the ambassador of Kuwait declared. "They were sent to the slaughter when Iraq went to war with Iran also, attempting to annex Iranian Khuzestan, which was proclaimed a part of Iraqi territory. We all recall to what sufferings the Iraqi people were subjected during the eight years of combat operations. The seizure of Kuwait was a logical continuation of this insane policy."

"Cruel sufferings were the lot also of Kuwaitis, when for seven months our country was in fact 'sealed off': no one could say precisely what in reality was being done in Kuwait. Now people can finally evaluate the situation objectively. It was no accident that the UN Security Council passed a number of resolutions condemning Iraq's occupation of Kuwait. These resolutions were aimed at depriving the Baghdad regime of the opportunity of creating weapons of mass destruction, contributing to a solution of the contentious border question with Kuwait in accordance with the 1963 agreement and returning to the Kuwaiti people what had been plundered. The priority task for us now is to restore what was destroyed by the Iraqi regime."

[Correspondent] The idea of the need for the creation of a new, really peaceful world order is currently up in the air, as they say. The intolerable nature of the continuation of regional conflicts is obvious. Who knows whether Saddam Husayn would have embarked upon his adventure had peace reigned in the Near East. What do you think about the prospects of a just all-embracing settlement in this region?

[Al-Du'ayj] A new peaceful world order would seem ideally to be the embodiment of the theory of the new political thinking proclaimed in the years of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, which made it possible to melt the icebergs of the cold war. It not only enables each people and each country to solve its own problems but also presupposes the participation of all states without exception—large and small—in the solution of global questions of world politics. Figuratively speaking, the presidents of the two great powers—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush—are currently at the helm of the ship containing all mankind. But captains cannot run a ship without sailors. All of us are these sailors. Practically the whole world community came to Kuwait's assistance at the time of Iraq's occupation. Which would obviously have been impossible without the new political thinking.

As far as the Near East as a whole is concerned, I have always been and remain on this question an incurable optimist. I sincerely believe that ultimately the problems of this region will be justly settled to the good of the peoples inhabiting it, as also that a satisfactory answer to the Palestinian question will be found for the Israelis and the Arabs—they will acquire the right to live in peace and harmony. And this will happen not least thanks to the joint efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States. The leaders of these states are acting the part, if I may put it thus, of co- trustees and guarantors of the success of the peace process in the Near East.

[Correspondent] Kuwait was the first of the Persian Gulf states to establish diplomatic relations with the USSR. Even having endured the Iraqi occupation, it recently granted our country a large loan. You know that Soviet people were on Kuwait's side at the time of the ordeals by Iraqi aggression and advocated the liberation and restoration of the independence of your country. But how are Soviet-Kuwaiti relations taking shape now, in your opinion? What are their prospects?

[Al-Du'ayj] Relations between our countries have been maintained for approximately three decades now. And will, I hope, develop for a further 300 and more years. Truly, in the difficult months for us of the Iraqi occupation we sensed the moral support on the part not only of the Soviet Government but the people of your country also. A people which knows about war at first-hand and which remembers the horrors that were perpetrated on your land when Hitler's Nazis crossed the USSR border. Letters of Soviet citizens published in the papers testified that they understood full well what the people of a small state which a big predator was attempting to swallow up had to be going through. We are grateful to them for this.

Kuwait is now the focus of attention of the whole world, which is expressing a desire and readiness to participate in healing its wounds. This is another example of what happened in Armenia following the December 1988 earthquake. We are now looking for assistance. Of Soviet specialists included—in extinguishing the fires in the oil fields ignited by the forces of occupation. This is very important for Kuwait. After all, oil is for us our "bread and butter," you might say.

Of course, just this, like the financial cooperation also—you mentioned Kuwait's loan to the Soviet Union—by no means exhausts our relations. Understandably, Kuwait would like the ties that have evolved between us in various spheres to strengthen subsequently also. The hard times you are experiencing are no obstacle to this. Your potential is unlimited.

Belonogov Receives Iranian Ambassador 6 Aug

PM0808105491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] On 6 August [USSR Deputy Foreign Minister] A.M. Belonogov received N. Izadi, ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran, at his request.

During the talk questions of bilateral relations were examined, as well as the present situation in the region, especially as regards the Near East and Afghanistan.

Friendship Treaty With India Extended 20 Years

LD0808175791 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 8 Aug 91

[By correspondent Boris Zaytsev]

[Text] New Delhi August 8 TASS—The Soviet Union and India today made a historic step in further strengthening and extending the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation. The two countries decided to extend the Soviet-Indian treaty on peace, friendship and cooperation, signed in August 1971, by another 20 years.

This statement was made by an Indian Foreign Ministry spokesman at a news conference here today. This crucial decision in the history of friendly relations is expected to come into force at midnight today, the spokesman said.

Further on Extension of Treaty

LD0808223991 Moscow TASS in English 215 GMT 8 Agu 91

[By correspondents Boris Zaytsev and Andrey Cherepakhin]

[Text] New Delhi Aug 8 TASS—The Soviet Union and India today made a historic step in further strengthening and extending the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation. The two countries decided to extend the Soviet-Indian treaty on peace, friendship and cooperation, signed in August 1971, by another 20 years.

This statement was made by an Indian foreign ministry spokesman at a news conference here today. In accordance with an article of the treaty, its term is automatically extended for another five years upon expiry of two decades. The decision comes into force at midnight today.

The treaty which meets the basic interests of the peoples of the two countries provided a reliable basis for the consecutive development of their multi-sided ties and is one of the important factors of the preservation of peace and security in Asia and throughout the world, says the joint Indian-Soviet declaration released today.

Considering that that document is paramount for the maintenance and strengthening of special friendly relations between India and the USSR, the two countries decided to extend it by another 20 years. The historic decision will formally enter into force in near future after the signing of a relevant protocol, the document runs.

The Soviet-Indian treaty on peace, friendship and cooperation remains an important factor of the preservation of stability in the South-Asian region, the world on the whole, serves further strengthening of traditionally friendly relations between the two countries.

This statement was made by participants in a meeting in the Indian capital today, marking the 20th anniversary of the treaty on peace, friendship and cooperation between India and the USSR.

The meeting, organised by the all-India committee for national unity, was attended by the general public, scientists, and politicians.

Gorbachev Greets Indian Leaders

LD0808211291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Aug 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] President Gorbachev of the USSR has sent a cable to President Venkataraman and Prime Minister Narasimha Rao of India containing greetings on the 20th anniversary of the treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India. The message expresses best wishes to the friendly Indian people. For their part, the Indian president and Prime Minister have sent greetings messages to the USSR president. The messages express deep satisfaction at the decision of the governments of our two countries to extend the treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation for a further 20 years.

Gorbachev Telegram Cited

LD0908074191 Moscow TASS in English 0731 GMT 9 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on Friday sent a telegram to Indian President Ramaswamy Venkataraman and Prime Minister Narasimha Rao on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Soviet-Indian treaty on peace, friendship and cooperation.

The treaty "has provided a legal basis and a firm support for a steady development of Soviet-Indian relations, which, especially over the past five years, have reached a new level of trust, accord and real interaction".

"The treaty continues the 1986 New Delhi declaration, which is an outstanding document of our time. It reflects the political, humanitarian and spiritual essence of relations between the two great peoples. Its ideas continue to live and work in the interests of the world community".

Gorbachev sent his best regards to the friendly Indian people and wished the Indian president and prime minister good health and success in their work.

The Indian leaders sent Gorbachev their congratulations, stressing the non-transient importance of the treaty for an onward development of multifaceted friendly Soviet-Indian relations, which greatly contributed to peace, stability and disarmament in the world. They expressed deep satisfaction with the Soviet and Indian Governments' decision to prolong the treaty for another 20 years. On behalf of the Indian Government and people they wished happiness and prosperity to the Soviet people.

Soviet-Indian Statement on Treaty

LD0908072891 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 9 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—The USSR and India have issued a joint statement in connection with the 20th anniversary of the signing of the treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of India.

"The treaty that meets the vital interests of the two countries' peoples became a reliable foundation for the development of their multi-faceted ties and a major factor of peace and security in Asia and the world," the statement says.

Under Article 11 of the treaty, once its term expires in 20 years, it is automatically extended for another five years, the statement says. "Mindful that this treaty is a fundamental document in maintaining and strengthening the special nature of friendly relations between the USSR and India, the sides decided officially to extend it for another 20 years. This will be done by signing a respective protocol shortly."

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary on Nikolayenko Pretoria Visit

MB0908094691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Afrikaans 1700 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Commentary by (Vladislav Chernuka)—read by announcer]

[Text] (Vladislav Chernuka) comments on the visit to South Africa by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Valeriy Nikolayenko:

It is the first time in postwar history that such a high-ranking Soviet official has visited Pretoria. This is all the more remarkable because of the fact that no links have existed between the two countries for past decades. Up until 1976 Moscow and Pretoria had maintained consular relations. Since then antiapartheid organiations have been legalized, their leaders freed from prison, and a start has been made under State President F.W. de Klerk to abolish apartheid.

As a result the USSR has started to expand contacts with South Africa at the political, economic, and humanitarian levels. This year the two countries opened interest sections in the Austrian Embassies in Pretoria and Moscow. The visit to South Africa by the Soviet deputy foreign minister is a logical consequence of this normalization process.

Upon his arrival in South Africa Mr. Valeriy Nikolayenko told journalists that the USSR is positively disposed towards the steps being taken by the South African Government to abolish the apartheid system, as well as towards the African National Congress' [ANC] constructive approach towards national reconciliation.

Mr. Nikolayenko declared that the Soviet leadership supports the process of a political settlement in South Africa, and he emphasized Moscow's readiness to help promote the process. This declaration of readiness is not merely rhetoric.

Soviet diplomats played an active role in defusing a series of complex situations in various parts of the world, and in one instance even cooperated with Pretoria. This was during the South- West African settlement, which led to Namibian independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. In turn, the Cuban withdrawal played an important role in the process that culminated in the end of the civil war in that country.

The USSR, together with Portugal and the United States, contributed considerably towards the Angolan settlement. Perhaps Deputy Foreign Minister Nikolayenko's talks with representatives of the South African Government and ANC leader Mr. Nelson Mandela will produce further results.

Meets With Botha

LD0808154691 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 8 Aug 91

[by special correspondent Sergey Kulik]

[Text] Pretoria August 8 TASS—South Africa follows with great interest the pace of reform in the Soviet Union, South Africa's Foreign Minister Roelof Botha said in Pretoria today during his meeting with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Valeriy Nikolayenko.

Botha said he closely studied the recent TV speech by President Mikhail Gorbachev on Union treaty [as received] and noticed a certain commonality of problems tackled by the two countries. Soviet experience can be useful for South Africans as well, the minister noted.

During the exchange of views that covered a wide range of international issues, including the situation in Africa, both sides stressed the importance of creating a new world order that would take account of the interests of all countries, including African countries.

Nikolayenko took note of the great importance which a democratic, non-racial South Africa could play in dealing with acute economic problems of African countries and peaceful settlement of conflicts on the continent. The sides favoured promoting cooperation in these fields.

Much attention was paid to prospects for political solutions of South African problems. The Soviet representative spoke out in support of the steps by the government of President Frederik De Klerk aimed at dismantling apartheid in South Africa. He also expressed hope for continuing the complex process at the negotiating table with the aim of creating a democratic state in the interests of South African people.

At a news conference held on completion of their meeting, Botha and Nikolayenko favoured developing relations between the USSR and South Africa.

Nikolayenko is due to meet Nelson Mandela, president of the African National Congress, in Johannesburg tonight.

East Europe

Serbian Assembly President Interviewed

PM0908091491 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Aug 91 First Edition p 6

[Interview in Belgrade with Aleksandar Bakocevic, president of the Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, by IAN correspondent S. Gryzunov under the "Situation in Yugoslavia" rubric; date not given; first three paragraphs are introduction: "Disastrous Redivision"]

[Text] Belgrade—Serbia and Croatia are the two main protagonists in the Yugoslav drama. The temperature of the disagreements between these two republics and their leaderships has risen beyond all conceivable limits.

Serbs and Croats lived peacefully side by side for centuries, from the early Middle Ages right up to the present century. World cataclysms caused the two peoples to collide. They were on different sides of the front in both World War I and II. Today once again the Serbs and the Croats are keeping each other in their sights. And each side upholds its own rightness in a conflict which has gone too far.

Observing a journalistic rule—first listen to all sides and then draw conclusions—I asked the top political leaderships of Croatia and Serbia to expound their viewpoint on what is happening. The stormy events of recent days and hours in Croatia and the change of government obviously prevented the republic's leaders from meeting with a Soviet journalist. I hope that this meeting will still take place. Meanwhile, Aleksandar Bakocevic, president of the Assembly (parliament) of the Republic of Serbia, found time to answer our correspondent's questions.

[Gryzunov] Representatives of Croatian political thought emphasize that a war is being waged in Yugoslavia not between Croats and Serbs but between democracy and communism. On the other hand, some people in Serbia believe that Slovenia and Croatia are waging a war against Yugoslavia, while others maintain that Croatia is waging war against Serbia. Whose opinion would you agree with, and where does the truth lie?

[Bakocevic] Right from the start Serbia advocated a peaceful and just solution to the conflict and answers to disputed questions by means of a dialogue between republics and between federal and republic organs and institutions. Serbia advocated and still advocates the preservation of Yugoslavia, not a split in it, and has not adopted any decisions unilaterally.

In order to answer your question, it is necessary first to emphasize the chief point: Who initiated the confrontation? The leadership of our republic has no intention of subjugating anyone. We take the following view of the situation which has taken shape: In Croatia illegally created armed formations attacked Serbian villages located on the republic's territory. Robberies began, and casualties occurred. The Serbian population rose to defend its homes and families.

Account must also be taken of the tragic history of the relationship between Serbs and Croats. During World War II Croatian fascist ustasas literally slaughtered 600,000 Serbs, and the Catholic Church forcibly baptized the Orthodox population. The memory of that is still alive, and the Serbs will not allow a repetition of genocide.

[Gryzunov] What is the republic parliament doing in this situation?

[Bakocevic] Both the Assembly and the entire Serbian leadership undoubtedly support the resistance of the rural [as published—selskogo; possibly misprint for "Serbian"—serpskogo] population in Croatia. We are doing all in our power to halt the bloodshed. At the same time we believe that the Yugoslav peoples must resolve their problems themselves. The settlement of the crisis depends on the degree of their preparedness for a dialogue.

However, this does not mean that we oppose assistance from the European or world community, if it is well-meaning assistance. And we view in this context the Soviet Union's readiness to send its own observers to the SFRY. But, I repeat, Yugoslavia's fate will be decided by the peoples which inhabit it.

[Gryzunov] What is your attitude to the decision of Slovenia and Croatia to annul the existing union with the other republics making up the SFRY?

[Bakocevic] If any people does not wish to live in the Yugoslav community, that is its right. But under conditions of a multinational federation this right must not be realized unilaterally, in an uncivilized way, infringing the rights of neighboring peoples.

The right to self-determination is not a right of individual republics but a right of peoples. Therefore Serbia opposes the unilateral decisions of Slovenia and Croatia. Our republic has linked its destiny with Yugoslavia, remains within it, and will build a new house together with other peoples with absolutely equal rights. I emphasize, Serbia does not want greater rights for itself than for others.

In addition, a redivision in a country such as ours, where peoples and ethnic groups are deeply mixed up, is a disastrous thing. Judge for yourself: Statistics show 1 million mixed marriages in our country. As a result of the conflict children are left without one of their parents, husbands renounce their wives, and sons their fathers. All this creates fear. War has most cruelly destroyed the peace in our families.

[Gryzunov] It seems, however, that they do not understand you at the other end of the line, so to speak, calling Yugoslavia "a prison for the Croatian people" and "a barbarous creation of communist Serbia."

[Bakocevic] Such propaganda, based on lies, will certainly be exposed. You cannot hide the truth. I will remind you that it was Croats and Slovenes, above all, who introduced to Yugoslavia and built the "communism" in question. Tito was a Croat, and his closest associate—Kardelj—a Slovene. The foundations of the economy were developed by the Slovene Kidric. So there is no need to blame the Serbs for everything. It is they who have lost most of all, particularly compared with their northwestern neighbors, throughout the history of the Yugoslav state.

[Gryzunov] In that case, where is the way out of the situation, and how do you see the country's future?

[Bakocevic] We advocate a civilized modern community, without the centralist trends ascribed to us, built on the principle of respect for other people's rights. And it is possible to reach agreement by peaceful means on the competence of all its members.

West Europe

Agreement Signed With FRG To Retrain Officers

PM0808135891 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, IAN, AP roundup: "Deutschmarks for Soviet Servicemen"]

[Text] Some 200 million marks are being allocated to the USSR for organizing the retraining of Soviet officers who were serving in Germany. An agreement to that effect was signed the other day between the FRG Federal Department for Credits for Reconstruction and the USSR Ministry of Labor and Social Questions. The agreement provides, in particular, for the modernization of 10 retraining centers in the Soviet Union, IAN reports.

Political & Social

Air Traffic Controllers Set Strike for 10 August

LD0908101691 Moscow TASS in English 1005 GMT 9 Aug 91

[By Rostislav Gertsev]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—"If our demands are not satisfied, we will begin a strike at midnight on August 10," Yevgeniy Radchenko, a representative of the Federation of Soviet Air Traffic Controllers, told TASS on Friday.

Beginning from midnight on August 10, air traffic controllers will be on their working places but will serve only flights of sanitary and state importance and other urgent flights. All passenger carriers already in the air will have to land after the strike begins. Other planes will remain on airfields.

By 11 A.M. on Friday, only some of the demands remain unmet, mainly through local civil aviation departments' fault.

Local departments in Rostov and Khatanga, Krasnoyarsk region, have not yet cancelled orders reprimanding air traffic controllers "for an attempt to go on strike" on May 21, 1991. Some departments either do not fulfill or distort Soviet Cabinet of Ministers Resolution 257 of May 17, 1991, which grants air traffic controllers a 36-hour working week and 48-working day leave, as well as lowers a retirement age to 50 years.

"The Federal Government, maybe unintentionally, has made a lot for air traffic controllers. [sentence as received] Now only some minor things remain, but we have got to be consistent to the end," Radchenko said.

Pilots Change Strike Plan

LD0808162391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] A sitting of the presidium of the All-Union Trade Union Association of the Crewmen of the USSR Civil Aviation has been held. It was decided not to hold a pilots' strike which was planned for 10 August, but to announce a strike situation from today until 2 September. This was dictated exclusively by people's interests: It is an extremely busy time for aviation—it is the time of summer holidays and school vacations. The rest will depend on the implementation of the pilots' demands.

Strike Termed 'Illegal'

LD0808164191 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS—In connection with the announcement of an air traffic controllers strike to begin on August 10, heads of the federation of air traffic controllers unions were called today to visit First Deputy Prosecutor-General of the USSR, Aleksey Vasilyev. He told them that the strike is illegal. He said it runs counter to Article 12 of the law of the USSR "On the Procedure of Settling Collective Labour Disputes (Conflicts)". The USSR deputy prosecutor-general also pointed to possible legal consequences of the strike.

The heads of the federation were officially warned of the impermissibility of violating the law of the USSR. In view of the fact that the latest edition of the Charter of the Federation of Air Traffic Controllers Unions included words about the right of the federation's members to hold strikes at enterprises and in organisations of civil aviation, the USSR prosecutor-general sent to the USSR minister of justice a protest against the decree of the USSR Ministry of Justice of June 25, 1991 about the charter's registration. The USSR prosecutor-general suggested that the decree be repealed and the registration certificate annulled.

KGB Denies Leaking Kryuchkov Speech

91UF1048B Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 29, Jul 91 p 2

[Letter from A.I. Karbainov, head of the USSR KGB Public Relations Center, published under the rubric "Mail"]

[Text] The weekly NOVOYE VREMYA (No. 27, July 1991) published an article by Irina Lagunina entitled "The First Leak." Expounding her theory on the source of the information leaked from the closed session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and who was behind the publication of the speech by the USSR KGB chairman, the author of this article arrives at the conclusion that the USSR Committee for State Security is privy to the publication of secret materials in the mass media.

I. Lagunina starts by relating the circulating "...rumors that the KGB Center of Public Relations itself made the 'material' available to the Leningrad journalist" and then reinforces her "arguments" by referring to confirmation of these rumors by the radio station "Ekho Moskvy" and the Russian Television program "Vesti." Then, without referring to any sources of information, she maintains: "The Committee for State Security made the speech of its chairman available to a journalist," and "the KGB has violated the ethics and working procedures of the nation's highest legislative body."

Leaving to the author's conscience all subsequent reasoning, conclusions, and versions built on these arguments, we want to formally state that neither the USSR KGB, nor the Public Relations Center passed any materials on the closed session of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the mass media.

We request that in accordance with Article 26 of the USSR Law on the Press and Other Mass Media our refutation be published in the NOVOYE VREMYA weekly.

Source of Leak Argued

91UF1048A Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 27, Jul 91 pp 10-11

[By Irina Lagunina: "The First Leak"]

[Text] **The contents of the closed session of the USSR Supreme Soviet has become public knowledge. What is it—a violation of the law? A provocation? Or an action for the public good?**

The first item to come into public view was the speech by KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov at the closed session of the national Supreme Soviet on 17 June. "It is not important who provided this tape," said Aleksandr Nevzorov turning on a tape recording of the chairman's speech. Several days later the newspaper POLITIKA, whose founder is the Soyuz deputy group, ran an exposition of all three speeches: the KGB chairman, the minister of defense, and the USSR minister of internal affairs. The material from POLITIKA was reprinted by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA. The three secret speeches of the top officials of three agencies appeared in the press. Translated into political parlance, this is called a leak of secret information.

Persistent journalists tried to find out from Aleksandr Nevzorov who had given him the tape; they guessed: Could it be that Colonel Alksnis, who appeared on the same broadcast, brought the tape to the Leningrad Television studio? Rumors circulated that the KGB Center for Public Relations itself made the "material" available to the Leningrad journalist. Their validity was confirmed by "Ekho Moskvy" and the Russian "Vesti." Well, did the KGB take responsibility for the disclosure of at least one speech, that of its own chairman? Did it have the right to do so?

The mechanism for conducting closed parliament sessions has already been well worked out. A session is considered closed if journalists are not permitted to be present, it is not broadcast over radio and television, and the transcript is not published for public perusal. This was worked out during all the sessions on the Nagornyy Karabakh issue and during the discussion of certain articles of the national budget. However, the mechanism for making decisions as to whether the session is to be closed is still not quite clear and is not defined in any documents. Normally, it happens this way: The session chairman says that there is a proposal to close the session—do the deputies agree with the proposal? Then a vote follows, or the answer to the question is provided by a positive or negative voice vote by the audience. Whatever the method, the right to decide whether the information is not for distribution belongs to the Supreme Soviet. Accordingly, the right to decide to make the information public also belongs exclusively to the national parliament.

The proposal to close the 17 June session came from the deputies. The basis for this: The conversation with the ministers and the chairman should be more open, and the information provided by the three agencies more complete and objective. Having listened to the speeches and having asked the three members of the national Security Council questions, the deputies did not change their decision about the nature of the proceedings: There was no agenda item concerning whether the session materials should be published.

Then, however, the Committee for State Security made the speech of its chairman available to a journalist. On what basis? There are only two explanations. Theoretically, one might imagine that KGB public relations personnel listened to the tape and, having decided that there were no departmental secrets in it, gave it on their own to Nevzorov, who, as it turned out, had been the first to contact the KGB about the closed session. In this case we will soon hear (or should have heard by now) that those responsible for disclosing secret information have been punished. Putting the top brass on the spot—nobody gets away with it. However, it is hard to buy this version of "unauthorized action" in such a regimented organization. It is much more likely that the speaker himself sanctioned making himself public. One way or the other, it comes to the fact that the KGB has violated the ethics and working procedures of the nation's highest legislative body.

By the way, other smaller issues arise in the process. The KGB chairman's speech declassified a 1977 KGB report to the CPSU Central Committee—a document that is classified as "extremely important." On what grounds? Does the CPSU Central Committee, which certainly is still keeping this document classified, agree to such a sudden declassification of its archives? Has V.A. Kryuchkov informed the Central Committee that he intended to declassify this intelligence report? And, in general, what guidelines did the speaker use in declassifying this document, since state security, as well as other state bodies, has no clear definition of what constitutes a secret document and what does not, or what the procedures are for declassifying previously secret documents?

As for the parliament, it probably would like to find out how two other items from this closed session were leaked—the speeches by Minister of Defense Yazov and Minister of Internal Affairs Pugo. The USSR Supreme Soviet has a Deputies Ethics Commission, which ostensibly should have engaged in this investigation. After all, the materials were published in the newspaper founded by the Soyuz deputies group.

"We do not conduct any investigations," is how chairman Anatoliy Denisov explains the silence on the part of the commission. "We only consider obvious violations of deputy ethics by specific deputies. And only in those instances when we receive a complaint that such ethics have been violated. Our status does not allow us to act on our own initiative. We cannot start an investigation of why the materials of the closed session were made public because nobody has asked us to start such an investigation—we have not received complaints from anybody. Neither the ministers, nor the deputies have expressed any indignation."

The parliament also has a subcommittee on procedures. This is what its chairman, Kim Yen Un, thinks about the incident:

"Our subcommittee has now submitted a proposal for the new Supreme Soviet regulations that whoever leaks materials from a closed session should be liable by law for violating procedures. So far, however, neither the USSR people's deputy status, nor any other documents specify what a deputy's liability is for disclosing such information. It is not written anywhere at all that closed session materials are not for distribution. Which means that in principle a deputy may make public any information, even information containing state secrets, since, on top of everything, he is protected by a deputy's immunity. Neither our subcommittee, nor the Deputy Ethics Commission can deprive him of his deputy's mandate for any transgression. We can only give our approval for the procuracy to conduct an investigation of a criminal case, and, after the investigation is completed and if the deputy is found guilty, approve the initiation of criminal proceedings against him by the USSR Supreme Court."

In short, the Supreme Soviet does not have a procedure for dealing with such issues. What about international practice? We could not recall any instances of a closed session in either chamber of the U.S. Congress—they are not really practiced there; in committees and subcommittees, though, it is an accepted practice.

The congressional ethics committee has much greater powers. During the previous U.S. Congress, its ethics committees considered in closed sessions 11 cases of ethics violations in the Congress. In four instances, congressmen had to resign their office.

In the Supreme Soviet, however, they have not yet reached a conclusion as to what to do if the materials of closed sessions are made public. USSR People's Deputy Nikolay Engver, for instance, believes that the parliament should investigate how the texts of the speeches got published.

"I believe that the Supreme Soviet should now ask the organs of law and order to find out who had made this tape available for publication," says Engver. "And then the issue should be decided in full compliance with our criminal law. Vladimir Kryuchkov was specifically asked at that session: Is he revealing secret information to us or not? Kryuchkov answered that everything in his speech had been prepared specifically for the deputies. There should be an investigation, because this is not just an insult to the dignity of one deputy, we are talking about an insult to the dignity of the entire parliament. By our inaction we are now demonstrating that we are not a people who can defend the legal values of the state. Besides, such information leaks diminish the prestige of the nation's highest legislative body—deputies are being turned into toys in the hands of people who play some kind of political games."

Not all deputies agree with Engver. Some ask sardonically: What would have happened if it was left had been responsible for the leak instead of the right? Would they be accused of disclosing secrets and actions undermining state security? Some add to this that next time there is a leak it will be impossible to point fingers at the democrats.

Public interests do not entirely coincide with the specific concerns of the members of parliament. It is important for society to answer the question: Not who and how the leak was perpetrated, but who needed this action involving a threatening "secret" speech and its subsequent popularization and why?

As it turned out, the KGB chairman did not reveal anything new. On the contrary, he was trying to scare parliament members with old fears that have long outlived their usefulness—about the omnipresent CIA and the perfidious West. To some, apparently, it did not seem to be enough. So the militant conservatives (the Soyuz group with the help of its press—Nevzorov, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA), having clearly overestimated the effect, engaged in scaring the people. The result was embarrassing.

In general, we should be grateful to those who organized this leak of closed information from parliament. No matter what their motives, objectively they have accomplished a useful deed.

Now we know for a fact that the current leadership of our most secret agency simply has nothing of substance to say either to the servants of the people or to the people themselves: They cannot offer either good information or competent analysis. Instead, it is clearly trying to apply secret service methods to the political process. Our young parliament probably should not play along by making its plenary sessions secret when this is not needed. Because what we have heard can be classified as blackmail. Blackmail of the parliament, blackmail of the president, and blackmail of society. The best medicine against scare tactics and blackmail, however, is openness.

'Protection of State Secrets' Agency Set Up

PM0908094391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, INTERFAX, IAN, REUTER, UPI roundup: "Consultation Agency Instead of Censors"]

[Text] The Agency for the Protection of State Secrets in the Mass Media under the USSR Ministry of Information and the Press—that henceforth is the name of the department set up to replace the Soviet censorship department (the USSR Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Mass Media), which has been abolished by the Cabinet of Ministers, an IAN correspondent was told by Nikolay Glazatov, deputy chairman of the new agency. As he put it, it will mainly consult with the mass media on questions of the divulging of state and business secrets, and other secrets protected by law.

Polozkov Appointed to Agriculture Post

LD0908004291 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 8 Aug 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast—read by announcer]

[Text] Ivan Polozkov, former leader of the Russian Communist Party, has been appointed USSR first deputy minister of agriculture.

Academic Warns of Conservative Counterattack

PM0808143191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Aug 91 Union Edition p 3

[Article by A. Kiva, doctor of historical sciences: "A Step Back From the Abyss Has Been Taken With the Help of the Democrats and the CPSU Reformist Wing. How Can We Progress Further?"]

[Text] "What do we have in our country, dyarchy?" I heard as I listened to my colleague's excited voice over the telephone on the evening of 29 July. "Like in the period between February and October, 1917." He sensed my confusion and continued: "Prime Minister Pavlov said some strange things on the 'Topical Interview' program just now. He said that we are at the mercy of the West, as we are forced to buy foodstuffs and many other things there without which we cannot survive. That our country is being colonized... And all this on the day of the U.S. President's arrival! And what about the day of Gorbachev's speech in London after the 'G-7' meeting? As if to refute his claims that a new historical stage in cooperation between the USSR and the West is opening up, Central Television's Third Program broadcast warnings about the United States' all-pervading espionage system which is undermining the foundation of our defense capability. And remember how, not long before this, the leaders of certain departments in true Cold War style frightened USSR Supreme Soviet deputies with the mythical danger from the West. Meanwhile, Chief of General Staff General Moiseyev showed the spirit of the new partnership on a trip to the United States where he lavished smiles on all around him and gallantly kissed the hand of a woman who was obviously the wife of his American counterpart. How are we supposed to interpret this? Is this dyarchy?"

Indeed, the situation in our country is not exactly one of the simplest. But it is not dyarchy. And I will ask anybody who insists on this theory to draw a dividing line between these two authorities. And he would be stuck.

In fact, it was not a dyarchy that existed in 1917. It was the authority of a provisional government which believed in the possibility of the country's democratic development. And there were forces which, through every available means, rocked this authority in order to destabilize the atmosphere in the country, provoke chaos, sever all lifelines, and—on the crest of mass discontent intensified by the confusion of boundless demagogy and equally boundless and knowingly unrealistic promises—establish their own dictatorship. In fact, in this sense it is possible to talk about dyarchy today as well. Only the dividing line does not lie where most people simplistically imagine: that is, between the ruling CPSU on the one hand and the democrats on the other. Interests, views, and partialities, like mistakes and delusions, know no bounds.

I wonder how history will judge our democrats for the de facto breakdown of work on electing the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and the Constitutional Court? Indeed, the phrase "Politics is the art of the possible" is totally inapplicable here.

The democrats yielded to the feeling of complacency and self-satisfaction too soon. They started to fight among themselves. Reformers within the CPSU were pitted against democrats outside of the CPSU. There was no point in embarking once again upon the path of confrontation with a good half of the people's deputies from the Communist factions. After all, without their consent not a single draft law could pass through the Federation's Supreme Soviet. Was it not a policy of compromise which allowed the Russians to adopt a series of progressive laws?

The June victory of B. Yeltsin, G. Popov, and A. Sobchak, and N. Ryzhkov's crushing defeat at these elections; the unsuccessful debut in the same elections by eminent "Unionist" A. Makashov together with equally eminent communist and fundamentalist A. Sergeyev; and a number of other successful acts by reformers and democrats, including in the sphere of international relations, seem to indicate that for the first time in all the years of perestroyka the disposition of forces has moved in favor of democracy and opens the way for a crucial turning point in the course of reforms.

What, in my opinion, is needed to maximize the auspicious chance history is giving us to conquer totalitarianism?

We must set up socioeconomic supports for an antitotalitarian, democratic social order as quickly as possible. The key policies by which we will succeed in the given task are as follows: the redistribution of state property, privatization, shareholding, the development of lease relations, collective, mixed, and private forms of ownership, and joint enterprises (incorporating foreign capital).

At the moment, political passions seem to have died down. But this may just be the calm before the storm.

Basically, conservative forces are still carrying out reconnaissance work. They have not launched a general offensive against the reformers yet. But they may do. And no doubt they will if all progressive forces and all forces worried about the fate of their country fail to unite and reinforce the political structures of perestroyka. What, in my opinion, is needed for this?

First, the problem of relations between M. Gorbachev and B. Yeltsin continues to be extremely important.

Second, it clearly follows that a serious approach must be adopted regarding mutual relations between M. Gorbachev and the CPSU. At times we approach this issue too lightly. Already, on several occasions, foreign correspondents have asked me: Why doesn't M. Gorbachev show more decisiveness, relinquish the CPSU leadership, and leave the party altogether? And I reply: What for? Let the extremists, the fundamentalists, who miss the atmosphere of the era of dogmatism, leave first. As far as I can see, Gorbachev still hopes to breathe new life into the CPSU and give the party a realistic program which breaks with the old traditions of political terror and ideological pressure, social utopia and harebrained scheming. The only chance for the CPSU to preserve an historical perspective is to transfer to a social-democratic parliamentary party-style stance.

A policy of transforming this still powerful, semistate—if not wholly state—structure, which is what the CPSU is, would be the least painful for society. Therefore, why not try to profit from this opportunity?

Third, great hopes are pinned on the "Democratic Party of Russia's Communists." I consider the creation of this organization to be totally justifiable. It is a step toward social democracy, which serves the workers rather than the party elite. As for the RSFSR Communist Party, it has not really gotten off the ground yet. A hefty number of its apparatchiks are expressing the desire to fight for the restoration of the old order with all their might.

Fourth, there is no doubt that stability in our political life could derive from the "Movement for Democratic Reforms," which is currently being set up by such eminent progressive politicians as Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Ivan Laptev, and others who are renowned throughout the country and the world. I believe it may absorb a large number of our most intellectually and politically developed citizens, true patriots and true democrats who are sincerely concerned about the fate of our country. Undoubtedly, those who have difficulty finding a common language with people living in another historical era and according to another moral code will also be drawn to this movement. In this case, however, what interests me most is not so much the organization itself—which has yet to be created—but the comments surrounding it.

I confess that a lot of this was a surprise for me. One could have expected the emergence of a powerful democratic party or movement would encounter opposition from the totalitarian structures. But could we have expected confusion over the need for this step from the ranks of the radical intelligentsia? This is too much. Moreover, Gerry F. Haff, a leading American scientist and practical worker, noted that the "It seems that the Soviet intelligentsia, like the prerevolutionary Russian intelligentsia, is prepared to attack its natural allies rather than conclude an agreement with them."

Several radicals defensively raised the following question in the left-wing press: "So where were you, earlier, when we gathered the people at mass rallies and won the abolition of Article 6 of the Constitution?" And here is my answer: If it were not for such people as, for example, A. Yakovlev and E. Shevardnadze in the structures of supreme power, other rallies on the squares could have ended in tragedy. A political process can only proceed upward if it has powerful forces in support of it. At every stage. It is a kind of relay: In order to avoid interrupting a long-distance run, there is a constant change of runner.

Others say: Well, the idea in itself is good, but its implementation is several years too late. I am not convinced of the accuracy of such a stance. Democratic power structures upon which a new party can rely should have been formed.

They also say this: What is the point of setting up a party whose banners display the word "socialism," which prompts rejection from so many. Indeed, the polls indicate that only 7 percent of our young people are committed to the idea of socialism. We can expect that this generation, which will soon take the reins of the country's government into their own hands, will discard socialism as a social model from the outset. Most probably it is only the following generation (possibly influenced by the dashed rosy-hued hopes for market-based prosperity) will start to turn back toward the socialist idea.

Therefore, if the new party fails to reject the idea of socialism decisively, does this mean it has no future? No, I have another approach. Those forces which ignore the nature of mass awareness at every given moment are the ones that have no future. If in the very near future we do not create powerful political structures parallel with the CPSU and capable of competing with it, then the result could turn out that yet another generation of Soviet people will have no future.

And again. Yuriy Afanasyev shares his thoughts with us: "If Russian democratic forces are prepared even here (being active participants in the democratic movement—A.K.) to cooperate with the current USSR President, then they are guaranteed rejection from the republics refusing to enter the new Union. Finally—and this is the most alarming thing in my view—if they forget the role already played by 'Democratic Russia' to secure a victory for the democrats at the last elections, the extensive workers' movement (especially the miners), or the role of Sajudis, Rukh, and other people's fronts—that is, if they forget the true force which above all coerced the notorious center into signing such complex documents as the "Ninw plus One" statement—then where do the democratic reformers think they will find the mass support towards which, in their own words, they are striving?"

Yu. Afanasyev is a well-known face in the democratic movement and he must be given credit for debunking the theory and practice of totalitarianism. But I cannot accept his stance in which left-wing neo-Bolshevism is apparent even to the naked eye. The policy for renewing confrontation, and this time within the ranks of the democratic camp, constitutes the road to the abyss. Incidentally, "Democratic Russia" is also one of the pillars of our democratic process. Having become a symbol of the struggle against totalitarianism, it has done much for our progress forward. However, in my view it still has not managed to acquire the qualities which characterize a sound political organization. It is hindered by leftism. The problem of leadership has not been removed from the agenda. In fact, this is perhaps one of the most severe problems for the democratic movement.

The democrats must think seriously about how to protect their position in the light of a possible upsurge of attacks by "super-powerists," nationalists, national-communists, and so on. The processes under way in the Baltic region and other national republics are evidence that there is a national-democratic revolution in progress. This means that the nationalist factor serves as its primary driving force. This is the trademark of such revolutions. Another fact is that nationalism can manifest itself in many different forms—from patriotism to overt chauvinism.

In fact it is nationalist principles which have allowed these republics' people's fronts to win a swift and uncontested victory over the Communists. But communists in these parts are adapting their ideological stances, methods of working, and power structures to conditions where communism is being supplanted as a world view with striking speedand according to an inexorable logic by nationalism and religion. Before our very eyes, an amazing symbiosis is emerging between a primitive marxism, nationalism, and religion on the one hand, and the party-state structure with remnants of feudalism and an erstwhile patriarchal society on the other.

And the result? In the republics, the national-democratic revolution interrupted by the Bolsheviks has been revived, but can we say it does not affect the Union? What, then, is the Union without the republics? For many, the Union was previously associated with Russia—or, rather, the Russians. They were looked upon as an imperial nation. Russia foisted upon everyone a unitary imperial state and the procedures of barrack-style communism. But now, in these years of perestroyka, it has become clear that the Russians suffered from totalitarianism as much as, if not more than, other nations. Indeed, nowhere—or almost nowhere—has the national culture been so damaged as in Russia. A historic part of it—the Non-Chernozem Zone—has been brought to a sorry situation. National awareness has been undermined. Is it really an imperial nation?

B. Yeltsin managed just in time to redirect toward the center the fire of criticism in various Russian oblasts and also from Russians themselves for the damage caused to many republics. It is precisely the center which has become the main object of criticism from all sides. Already people are talking about B. Yeltsin's timely and successful step whereby, on behalf of all Russians, he extended the hand of friendship to the people of the Baltic and Transcaucasus. However, think about it. Are Yeltsin's moves, aimed at staying one step ahead of events, the only issue here? In actual fact, if Russia has been an object of unprecedented arbitrariness; if Russia has been exploited and pillaged in true colonial style; if the Russian culture has been repressed since time immemorial; and if the problem of a national revival has reared its head in Russia; then is it not the case that a national-democratic revolution is taking place there too? This question is far from academic. If you answer in the affirmative, which is my immediate inclination, then it is precisely in this, and nothing else, that you will find the reason for the increased attention to the nationalist idea.

So what conclusions can be drawn for our political practice from what has been said? First, we must take the process of sovereignization very seriously, and in particular we must stop comparing our republics to American states or German laender, as is often done on the pages of the press. They are essentially different. An American in any state is still an American. The concept of "Soviet" for a Lithuanian or a Georgian means nothing. It is vital to understand once an for all that the old Union has been exploded by the very course of history.

Second, the combination of an antitotalitarian, democratic, social revolution with a national-democratic revolution has placed tasks of inestimable difficulty before our society. Nowhere are these tasks equaled—not even in Yugoslavia, although their experience is valuable.

Third, whether we like it or not, processes will emerge in our country—indeed, they are already emerging—which are characteristic not just of an antitotalitarian, antioligarchic revolution but also of a national-democratic revolution. That is, the emergence of fundamentalist tendencies in the various spheres of our social life, the revival of archaic social and spiritual customs, outbursts of Makharov-style nationalism, overt fascism....

Obviously, nationalism in our country will increase no matter how hard we struggle with it. It will become steadily interlinked with marxism, transforming it into national-communism, deeply penetrating the lumpen milieu, spawning social aggression. It is here, as I see it, that reaction in the old and new sense will seek out its political niche. Democrats will be accused of antipatriotism and of striving to destroy our thousand-year-old state, failing to understand the soul of the people, especially the Russian people, betraying the nationalist idea in humility to the West, and of colonizing the country, etc.

We must be ready for all this. A lumpen society, which ours is, is very vulnerable to all types of extremes. Pay attention, as such conditions gave rise to the victory of bolshevism, fascism, Islamic fundamentalism. Always at crucial times in history's development, at those times when a critical mass of lumpen people was created, and the collapse of the old, familiar lifestyle had a very long head start on the formation of a new order.

Nevertheless, I believe in the collective reason of the people. After all, we are in a bad situation now but the masses have not yielded to the provocation and slogans of V. Zhirinovskiy or A. Makashov. The people elected B. Yeltsin as Russian president. And Moscow is bitter that it is a long time since it has lived so poorly and so squalidly. But even here the people preferred the Democrat G. Popov, just like in the decaying Leningrad where they chose the Democrat A. Sobchak. It is no accident. I think it is a reflection of the historical tendency toward the inevitable victory of what is new.

Moscow Party Chief on Central Committee Plenum

AU0908090391 Vienna SALTO in German
9 Aug 91 p 7

[Article by Yuriy Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Politburo and Moscow party chief: "Two New Parties in Moscow?"]

[Text] For us it would be desirable—and we discussed this at the plenum—to preserve the core of the party and to free ourselves of the extremists, the followers of orthodox Marxism, and those who are for a direct capitalization of Soviet society, for a change of its social system.

The Central Committee plenum took place in such a spirit. The majority of its participants—at least three-quarters, in my view—came out in favor of reforming socialism and continuing restructuring. Of course, the standpoints concerning how these reforms are implemented and which character they should have did not always coincide. The most important thing was, however, that practically all were for reforming society. Orthodox, extreme standpoints also emerged, but they were not as strong as in the past.

If one transferred the atmosphere of the plenum on the entire party, it would be preferable to have the version that envisages a radical renewal of the CPSU and the departure of those members that do not agree with the programmatic, ideological, and political goals.

However, one must take into consideration that it is mainly the best informed and educated communists who belong to the Central Committee. At the grass roots there are both followers of the orthodox movement and those who adopt an ultraleftist attitude and demand a change in the social character of the Soviet Union.

In my view, that development is the most probable in which the majority, who calls for reforming society in line with the socialist principles, will remain in the CPSU.

In addition to the CPSU, two new parties could be founded, for instance the Orthodox Party and the Democratic Party of the Russian Communists—the latter with Aleksandr Rutskoy, deputy president of the republic, at the head, a party that claims the role of a union party. I believe that in the sociopolitical situation that has developed the future of that part of the party is ensured that is for continuing the reforms and for the democratization of the party.

Editor's note: We thank NOVOSTI Vienna for making this article possible.

Manayenkov on CPSU's Organizational Tasks

PM0808084091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Aug 91 Second Edition p 3

[By Yu. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, as part of "Discussion Sheet No 103": "Where Is Danko Leading Us?"]

[Text] However paradoxical life may seem, however full of contradictions, there is always room for new paradoxes and contradictions. Some of them change life by virtue of their primacy and scale, becoming the soul and content of general existence. Others are short-lived and fragmentary. But there is a third kind—those that are more like bizarre incidents. Fruitless at best, but more often troublesome, and at times frankly shameful. Like the scene with Gorkiy's Danko, whose comrades, lost and desperate in the night, called on him in hope and enthusiasm: "Lead us!" but when the only path to salvation proved to be thorny, started grumbling and forced the valiant torchbearer to set fire to his own heart.

An extremely topical allegory, I must say. It comes to mind when you talk with Communists—and not only Communists—in the localities, when you read the press and letters to the Central Committee, in short, when you think about the party's future. The growing economic and political crisis in the country has brought us to a point where delight and declarations of love for the party and its offspring, perestroyka, are behind us, escape from the gloom has yet to come, and as for the thorns, here they are: half-empty shelves, exorbitant prices and shortages, flagrant crime, national upheavals, mercilessness. All this is, so to speak, crying out against the party, which has assumed the role of torchbearer. Voices like the one in the letter from N.F. Grin in the Crimea, who says that "perestroyka is like a total refurbishment, you have to put up with the inconvenience for a certain time," or like the report by A.V. Mikhaylova and V.V. Prikhodko from Kherson that "the attitude toward the Communist Party is changing, though slowly, for the better, and a saying has sprung up in the villages of the Ukraine: 'When we had the Communists, we had something to eat; when the democrats came, the huts were empty'"—voices like these are the exception, only highlighting more sharply the seemingly immortal mob instinct to seek a sacrificial Danko as an answer to every conceivable problem. But will this light the way out of the gloom? Especially since the way is hedged about with new, unprecedented dangers.

No doubt many recent CPSU Central Committee leaders, those who started perestroyka, illuminated the path to salvation for society in precisely this sacrificial way—after all, it was almost beyond human powers to seek out the truth and follow it. But here we have it—"his majesty" the bizarre. When they had entered the testing zone, some people imperceptibly let go of their torches and slipped away into the shadows, to the safe ground by the wayside. Others urge you to warm your hands at someone else's fire.

But I see before me the face of a good man, a Communist, 30 years of age, who became a party member in the perestroyka years, because of perestroyka, and I hear his question, a question as direct as his gaze, the question of a whole generation:

"But what about us?"

What, indeed? Is the pusillanimity of those who look ahead morally preferable to the pusillanimity of those who turn back? Paradoxical reality is now doubly paradoxical, sometimes changing the places of the leader and the led. It is no wonder that ideological confusion has arisen among some Communists, that it is taking the form of disunity, isolation, and sometimes outright differentiation and division into currents, groups, and subgroups.

Those were shameful times when "not daring to have your own opinion" was valued. But declarations, deeds, and actions aimed, consciously or unconsciously, at destroying the CPSU are also shameful—in fact, extremely dangerous. This only plays into the hands of those who have no interest in finding the way to the light. In the attempt to blow up the party from inside, they insinuate casuistical thoughts on the possibility of mutually opposed currents and factions existing within the party, on the inevitability of its renewal through confrontation within the party and the division of Communists into "conservatives" and "liberals," "progressives" and "orthodox." And, you know, they are not doing this in vain. These ideas start finding roots within the party and developing into populism, rally mania and demagoguery, ambition, and national shortsightedness. In short, all the things that are leading the party toward a split.

But that is not enough for the opposition. It is not simply kindling dissatisfaction among the people, it has moved on to open anticommunist hysteria, and is working coordinatedly and persistently to make an enemy image out of the CPSU. The tactics of stings and pinpricks have passed—now a strategic alliance is growing up among forces opposed to the CPSU which have decided, according to the logic of the adventurist political struggle, to band together in a nationwide opposition. But *the CPSU is part of society, the most organized and structured part, penetrating all its pores, the entire organism. You cannot hit the party without society feeling the pain.* And the confrontational "patterns" tried out on the party will fit society too. In fact, they are already at work. The idea of the inevitability of confrontation is being instilled into society. The foundations have been laid in the mass consciousness for thinking to follow the principle of contraposition of "Communists versus democrats," "working people versus cooperative members," "kolkhoz members versus private farmers"—that is, the splittist pattern that is being imposed on the party is also in evidence here.

A dangerous symptom. Remember what resulted from the division imposed by Stalinism, into "our people" and "enemies," "us" and "them." But some people in the anticommunist camp are making no secret of the fact that confrontation in society is an instrument of struggle, and its purpose is to change the social system. If that happened, the country would be plunged into an abyss of upheavals and an avalanche of difficulties that would come to rest entirely on the shoulders of the people. Can the party of social protection of working people, the party that upholds civil peace and social consensus, permit such a turn of events? No way. So it should *strengthen its unity. By strengthening its own unity, the party strengthens society's unity.*

Unlike the country's other present-day parties, the CPSU does not combat differences of opinion, even in its own ranks. But there is pluralism. *We do not waive the principle of democratic centralism in the Leninist sense, an essential condition of which is: freedom of opinion—unity of action.* Argue if you like, but while a decision is in force, be so good as to fulfill it. The arbitrary suspension of collective thought, multiplied by even some of the total number of party organizations, could cause paralysis of the collective will. And in the present extremely tense transitional period of society, we need that more than ever. A diversity of opinions in the party, however varied, debatable, contentious, and perhaps even contradictory these opinions may be, must not develop into a diversity of interests, the flouting of the CPSU statutes, and the ideological and therefore organizational splintering or fragmentation of our forces.

It is apposite to recall that the new party statutes adopted by the 28th Congress (adopted, incidentally, with the participation of those who are now warming themselves at other people's fires) state: "It is not permitted to form factions within the CPSU with their own internal discipline; this does not restrict the rights of Communists to unite on the basis of platforms in the course of debates." This thesis needs to be consistently translated into practice. The process of weakening of party ranks and the trend toward group loyalties and factionalism are prompted not so much by external political forces or any shortage of decisions on our part, as by the shortage of discipline and responsibility, the shortage of action. The 28th CPSU Congress, Central Committee plenums, the Politburo and Secretariat, and CPSU Central Committee commissions have provided the party with fundamental, scientifically validated documents, including normative and methodological documents, in virtually all the main areas of activity. But to a significant extent these have not yet been picked up in real organizational work, many party organizations are in a state of paralysis, and the Communists' interaction and mutual exactingness have grown slack. Some of them have not yet found their place or come to terms with the forms and methods of party political activity under the new conditions, others are waiting to see "which way the wind blows," others again have preferred to get on their "high horse" and stand aside. There are renegades too. Having grown up in the bosom of the party and taken from it everything that a ruling political structure can give, they are now fighting it, and some of them are actually leading this struggle.

Many party organizations have become reconciled to the Communists' recalcitrance and inertia and their spontaneous exodus from the CPSU, and they sometimes try to pass this off as exclusively a process of self-purification, taking no real steps to stabilize their membership. Admissions to the party have declined, but people are voluntarily leaving it. In 1990 the exodus totaled 1.8 million people, and one-fifth of the shop party organizations and half of the party groups ceased to operate. In some republics and oblasts party organizations are in a state of "siege," and are being driven out of the labor collectives.

This process is very painful. But it is curable. And the best medicine now is *the resolute organizational and political strengthening of the CPSU on the reliable basis of organization, discipline, activeness, Communists' initiative, and their sense of responsibility for the party's fate.*

What should we concentrate on as a priority? There are a whole series of practical tasks.

Primary organizations should be placed at the center of all efforts in practice, and they should be given help in adapting to the atmosphere of autonomy provided by the new statutes. But it would be a mistake to think that the corresponding norms will automatically come into action—we need recommendations, we need constant contact between the leadership of the party, reskoms [republic party committees], kraykoms [kray party committees], obkoms [oblast party committees], okruzhkoms [okrug party committees], gorkoms [city party committees], and raykoms [rayon party committees] and the primary components, and creative interpretation of and influence on the processes taking place there.

Every party organization should have a clear plan of action on the most acute problems of day-to-day life. The most important thing is to act, to attract people to join in creative work, to break out of the phase of confusion and uncertainty. In the light of proposals put to the 28th CPSU Congress, the Central Committee Secretariat, together with the union republic Communist Party Central Committees, set up a Council of Secretaries of Primary Party Organizations under the CPSU Central Committee. We hope that it will play a major part as coordinator of the aforementioned work. Party raykoms and gorkoms should act as its creative centers in the localities.

It is extremely important to create the right attitude in the primary party organizations and among Communists toward the new CPSU statutes registered at the USSR Ministry of Justice *and toward the party's normative and methodological documents.* On condition that democratic mechanisms for stimulating the Communists' activity and initiative are fully active, we should equally consistently observe the provisions that ensure organization, discipline, responsibility, and the fulfillment of adopted decisions.

It is a task of vital importance to conduct the task of recruiting fresh forces to the CPSU's ranks on a daily basis, persistently, and systematically, as a partywide job of strategic significance. Admissions to the CPSU should become the core of the primary party organizations' activity and one of the main criteria for assessing the effectiveness of this activity and the party's prestige among the people. At the same time we should equally resolutely rid ourselves of those who discredit the party, of all kinds of "turncoats" and deserters. There is no reason to fear that the party will suffer quantitatively—it will gain qualitatively. Assessing a similar situation, V.I. Lenin once wrote: "The cowards and good-for-nothings have fled the party. Good riddance! *That kind of reduction in the number of members of the party constitutes a huge increase in its strength and weight."*

But this work must be organized sensitively, tactfully, on an individual basis, and that includes work with everyone who has cut himself off from party life. Some people are deluded, confused, and have lost their faith, but are basically honest and capable of acknowledging their mistakes, and they must be brought back into active work.

The political and moral isolation of people who have left the party cannot be tolerated, still less the transformation of a former member of the CPSU into its enemy. The possibility must remain of returning to the party if a hasty departure has given way to new insight, especially since such cases are becoming increasingly common.

In these difficult times it is important not to ignore any Communist comrade. It would be useful to resume the practice of individual talks, and questions of the fulfillment of statutory duties and party instructions should be raised more frequently at meetings. An effective system of social support and legal protection should be set up for

Communists, particularly for party organization secretaries and the elected aktiv, to protect them against indirect and sometimes direct threats and pressures resulting from their work.

There are party organizations which have lost their effectiveness and are embarking on the path of factional struggles. Here the solution is to reorganize them, hold early elections to replace the discredited bureaus and secretaries, and bring in some really responsible and militant party members.

There should be support for party organizations where they organically combine an exacting and principled approach with an attitude of goodwill, true party comradeship, and solidarity, and on this basis stabilize their personnel, maintain a reserve for replenishing their ranks, and actively cultivate that reserve. In 1990, 108,000 people were admitted to the CPSU—fewer than in previous years. But they are truly the flower of society, people who are generally strong-minded and profoundly committed to the socialist choice and perestroyka.

It would be expedient to go halfway to meet those who want to join the CPSU if because of circumstances that have arisen in a number of regions they are unable to realize their desire at their place of work. They should be given the opportunity to join the party in another collective or in their neighborhood, naturally with the necessary exactingness being displayed. Here the organizing role of party raykoms and gorkoms is particularly great.

There should be a new approach to recruiting young people to the CPSU's ranks, finding unconventional ways to reach the hearts of young men and women, and turning the Komsomol [communist youth league] into the party's cadre reserve, despite all the difficulties inherent in the relationship with the Komsomol. To this end effective use could be made of party-Komsomol meetings, plenums, and other joint events, the promotion of associations of worker, scientific, and student youth in support of the CPSU, and the organization of youth clubs and groups of young Communists and party sympathizers. We should carefully seek out people with an inclination toward political activity and enlist war and labor veterans and other prestigious Communists to systematically select and prepare them for party membership. Attempts to exclude the Komsomol from schools and other educational establishments should be opposed systematically. The influence of Communists who are teachers and parents should be used to this end. *Young people are the party's cadre reserve and future, and we must work with them from the standpoint of the demands of not only today, but tomorrow.*

Amid the growing torrent of newborn parties and would-be parties that eagerly seize on and absorb initiatives and ideas that do not belong to them, *the CPSU cannot survive, unless it resolutely eradicates ideological weakness and grows some muscle in the sphere of theory.* It is no use reciting like a ritual incantation the reassuring formula that Marx' doctrine is omnipotent because it is true. And this is not because V.I. Lenin was wrong in this assertion—he was right. A doctrine remains omnipotent while it remains true. And it can only do that by developing, renewing itself, embracing in the light of scientific logic new and hitherto concealed sectors and strata of social life, and interpreting them appropriately—better still, keeping a step or two ahead in the thought process.

The crisis of party practice was predetermined by the theoretical famine and the atrophy of the party's ideological institutions. A feeble idea does not stimulate energetic action. This must be reflected in the new CPSU program, from the standpoint of the most rigorous self-analysis, or, if you like, healthy remorse. Many Communists see the speediest adoption of this program—as the CPSU Central Committee Plenum in July acknowledged—as the first step away from the ideological confusion which is causing both political and organizational ferment in the party. But *we must also unequivocally declare our fundamental rejection of the slogan of total deideologization, which in practice becomes the reideologization of society, or anticommunism.* Otherwise the party's acquisition of political will is highly problematic.

Party organizations *should renounce defeatist and pessimistic sentiments, refuse to yield to attacks by anticommunists, show restraint,* and consistently adhere to the territorial and production principle enshrined in the CPSU statutes. As the party expressing the political and social interests of the main bulk of the working people, it should be present in the sphere of application of their labor, work in their collectives, and work with them, in collaboration with other social formations and movements, to build new production relations and new forms of economic and social life.

The party's renunciation of administrative edict methods and inappropriate state administration functions should not lead to its cutting itself off from the resolution of socioeconomic problems. This tendency exists, and I will say frankly that it is developing, little by little, into a creeping economic disorder making its comatose way across the country. It must be stopped, and the attention of party organs centrally and locally must be focused on socioeconomic problems and on mastering political methods of influencing the study and resolution of these problems.

And another thing. *We must sort ourselves out organizationally,* because since the abandonment of rules governing the frequency of meetings, Communists have patently lacked organized contact and a sense of unity, and, indeed, information. This has a disruptive effect on party life.

Finally, about *strengthening the CPSU's finances.* I must say quite clearly: *Anyone who attacks the party's finances today is acting in the interests of its opponents.*

Clearly the process of organizational and political strengthening of the party and its unity is proceeding with difficulty and far from smoothly. I have only highlighted some—perhaps the most widespread—phenomena and trends, and on the basis of the range of problems outlined, I have set forth my personal vision of them: assessments, considerations, desiderata. The legendary torchbearer sprang to mind not because of a desire to match his feat to the party's messianic role. I only wanted to lift the curtain a little on what is happening to the party today, what it is and where it is, and to show that its potential is far from exhausted and that there is no shortage of worthy and bright hearts within it. In these people nothing has extinguished the *will and ability really to be in the forefront, to take the lead, and, incredibly difficult as it may be at present, to safeguard unity—because without unity and cohesion, there is and can be no party.*

Ogarkov Interviewed on Plenum, CPSU Program

914B0286A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Aug 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, member of the commission for development of the new CPSU Program, chairman of the All-Union Council of Veterans of War and Labor, by A. Orlov; place and date not given: "A Word After the Plenum: It is Time To Take a Stand"]

[Text] **Chairman of the All-Union Council of Veterans of War and Labor, Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov was elected member of the Commission for Development of a new CPSU Program at the 28th Party Congress. We met with him after the completion of the work of the plenum, whose results are attracting general attention today.**

[Orlov] Nikolay Vasilyevich, are you satisfied with the discussion of the issues raised at the plenum?

[Ogarkov] Yes and no. Yes, since it seems that we have finally recognized that it is impossible to continue to structure and restructure the society without a clear-cut idea of where this is leading. And no, because in our troubled times, when essentially the fate not only of the CPSU but also of the state is being decided, we communists have not yet taken a stand on many things.

[Orlov] And that is undoubtedly reflected in the draft party program which was discussed by the plenum participants.

[Ogarkov] Yes. We members of the program commission have already considered several versions of the draft program. There were many negative remarks even about the last version, which was discussed in July under the leadership of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. They demanded significant improvement or even a rewriting of the draft. Formally, the version submitted at the plenum was officially the fourth, but in reality, I think, it was the sixth. Compared to the preceding one it was reduced by half and it differs appreciably from the previous one, but, as was shown by the plenum discussion, it also suffers from many imperfections.

The draft's main shortcoming is its vagueness. Overall it has the nature of a statement and one can discern a desire to satisfy all the contradictory trends and platforms not only in the CPSU but also in society as a whole. For example, the draft does not even say that the goal of the party is to build a socialist society as a society of justice and one that is free of man's exploitation by man. In the introduction all it says is that the proposed program is a program for movement toward a humane democratic society that suits everyone. In the first section it proclaims that the party expresses the interests of the working people, and the fourth section expresses that the party does not give preference to any social stratum, and so it deals in the same way with both workers and entrepreneurs. Further, the second section gives a harsh assessment of the past. Yet there is no analysis of mistakes made even during the course of perestroyka which led to a deep crisis in the party and the country. Is this objective?

Moreover, the draft ignores the results of the nationwide referendum on the preservation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a renewed federation. It speaks only of some "**transformation** of the Soviet multinational state into a democratic federation of sovereign republics." And subsequently there is even a discussion of a "federation of sovereign **states**," that is, essentially a confederation.

[Orlov] I know that you were prepared to speak at the plenum but did not have the opportunity. Did you want to talk about that?

[Ogarkov] Not only about that. But from the future program, if it is adopted in this form, it is not clear what will be the economic basis of the society we are building. Under vague formulas of "economic freedom," "structural rearrangement," "free competition of producers," and others, essentially there is hidden a rejection of the fundamental principles of socialism with unconditional priority for public forms of ownership. Further, the draft contains no clear confirmation of the principle of democratic centralism in the party. And it turns out that it is not necessary for a communist to participate in the work of one of its organizations. And instead of paying membership dues it is possible to give voluntary material aid to the party to the extent that this is possible. But that is the Menshevist formula. V.I. Lenin spoke out sharply against that in his day. I am not even talking about the fact that the draft does not reflect the need to unmask petty bourgeois ideology and resist the forces of antisocialism and anti-Sovietism.

Without going into a detailed discussion of these shortcomings, I would like to discuss just one idea: It is surprising how difficult it is for remarks and suggestions from members of the program commission to be accepted and discussed if they are directed toward bringing the draft program into line with the decisions of the 27th and 28th Party Congresses. One gets the impression that someone who is drawing up the draft does not like these decisions very much today.

[Orlov] Do you think that many communists and nonparty members share your view?

[Ogarkov] As chairman of the All-Union Veterans Council I receive many personal and collective appeals and letters from people of the older generation who have gained wisdom through experience in life. The majority of them express deep concern about the situation in the country. As a military person I am also aware of views that are widespread in the army and navy. And I simply have a lot of contact with people. I can say quite definitely that many people today have come to their senses after being hypnotized by eloquent slogans. Life itself is showing through more than anything else. In past years there has been a sharp drop in the people's standard of living. Let us just take these same veterans: At the beginning of the year there were more than 58 million pensioners in the country and the average amount of their pensions, not counting compensations, was 109 rubles [R]. And more than 13 million people receive the minimum amount: R70-100 plus R85 in compensation. How are they to live under market conditions? But even under these extremely difficult conditions the majority of letters, appeals, and statements from veterans betray a deep concern for the situation in the country.

Many people today cannot understand why people are being allowed to destroy Soviet power, ignore the country's constitution, and cast aside the social achievements gained through the labor of the older generations. Why are nouveaux riches, speculators, and all kinds of machinators openly in charge today? Why is the chaos and outbreak of anticommunism allowed. Ultimately, what is behind this? Ignorance and a lack of understanding on the part of the country's leaders? Fear and the inability to take decisive constitutional measures to impose order? Or perhaps there is a deliberate intention to deceive the people and to gradually change the social and state structure?

I will mention one more thing. We have a great desire for peace, but the struggle for peace is a two-way street. It can only be real when there is a reciprocal movement. And as of today there is clearly not enough of this kind of movement: The Warsaw Pact has been disbanded but NATO remains, the West has not cut a single military program, the United States has not abandoned its "from a position of strength" policy or the achievement of military superiority, and they are leading things to a point where the world will be, in the words of the U.S. President, unipolar. Nor should we underestimate the growth of revanchism and neofascism in a number of countries. No, nobody is calling for a confrontation or a return of the cold war. On the contrary. But we cannot consider the military threat to have been removed as of today. Therefore it would seem that the draft program should contain a more balanced assessment of the world situation.

[Orlov] Apparently all these questions will be raised at the next regular party congress. Is it possible to speak now about predictions: What will it be like?

[Ogarkov] The veteran community, which I represented at the plenum, supports the decision to convene a party congress this year. The demand for an extraordinary congress from communists of the older generation was extremely insistent. The reasons were all the same: One cannot but see that the decisions of the last party congresses and the 19th Party Conference are actually being ignored. A replacement of the social structure is in the offing and an open movement toward capitalization of the economy has begun. This is essentially a degeneration of perestroyka.

We are legitimately proud of the conquests of socialism—the friendship of peoples, the social guarantee of employment, recreation, and housing, free education and public health, and the lack of unemployment. And what is happening now? Even unemployment is almost being passed off as an achievement of perestroyka.

The so-called "Movement for Democratic Reforms" has appeared. This phenomenon also requires an assessment by a communist forum. The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat thinks that this movement is directed toward "consolidation of the party and society." Is that true? Everything tells us that E. Shevardnadze, A. Yakovlev, A. Sobchak, and others are leading us not to consolidation but to a split. This is another attempt to strike a blow at the CPSU and change the structure of the state and social apparatus. In Moscow, where one of the organizers of this movement, G. Popov, has come to power, the Soviet power structure is already practically being dismantled. With the obvious complicity of the USSR president and the government. And in Russia, by a ukase of the RSFSR president, the party has been driven out of the labor collectives, and again the USSR president is in no hurry to override the ukase, which is directed toward subverting legality and the idea of a rule-of-law state. Where will we go next?

As for predictions, I think that the CPSU congress will not be as calm as the recently completed plenum was. It would seem that it will look closely at the situation in the party and the country and give a clear-cut assessment of the CPSU's course. I would like to believe that it will be free of the "fifth column" and flip-floppers in its ranks and adopt a new and integrated program and, taking this into account, it will elect effective new leaders. I am confident that after this the party will resume its lost position as the vanguard of Soviet society.

Republic Officials Comment on Union Treaty

OW0908110091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0921 GMT 9 Aug 91

["Nation and Society'; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In today's issues we again address the topic of the Union treaty. The Ukraine, as is known, has not yet agreed to sign the treaty. You have already been able to learn the point of view of the chairman of the Ukrainian Higher Soviet, Leonid Kravchuk, in the pages of the collection. Today, one of the leaders of RHKh [Ukraine People's Movement for Perestroyka], Bogdan Ternopilski, gives his opinion on the question.

Another republic, Georgia, has already decided on its relationship to the Treaty, in favor of independence. The Minister of Foreign Affairs in Georgia, Georgi Khoshtariya, talks to "IF" [INTERFAX] correspondent Mikhail Vorobyev on this decision, and the problems which Georgia faces.

As regards Kazakhstan, it will enter into the new Union. The problems here are different. One of the most serious questions still pending, is that of how to divide ownership between the union and the republic under the conditions of privatization. Our correspondent Andrei Tugay, who visited Kazakhstan, addresses this question.

The Union Treaty From The Point Of View Of The Ukrainian Rukh

A correspondent from "IF" talks to one of the leaders of Rukh, Bogdan Ternopilski.

Correspondent: Do you feel that, among the parties which make up Rukh, there is a common opinion concerning the future of the Ukraine?

Ternopilski: Absolutely all of the parties in RUKh see the Ukraine as an independent republic which will decide all of its problems independently, conduct international and internal politics, have its own currency and own army, basically, all attributes of an independent government. The one difficulty is in a difference of approach, the ways to decide the question. In particular, the Ukrainian Republican Party declares that any treaty, political or economic, encroaches upon the independence of the Ukraine. They feel that treaties can only be made with individual republics, and that there should not be a difference in the procedure of deciding on a treaty with the republics of the Soviet Union and with such republics as Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, Belgium and others. But the Ukrainian Democratic Rebirth Party, for exammple, upholds the position that the Soviet Union be reformed into a commonwealth of sovereign powers. Of course, if RUKh unites the members of many parties, it should unite their positions as well. That is to say that we state plainly that the idea which is the basis of our proposition, the foundation of our slogan, is the idea of an independent government in the Ukraine.

Correspondent: The results of the all-Union referendum of March 17th are interpreted differently today, some say it manifests the will of the Ukrainian people "for the federation," and others say it is "for the confederation." How do you feel about this loose interpretation?

Ternopilski: The Ukrainian people decided that the Ukraine can enter into a union or unions with other governments only according to the principles of the Declaration on governmental sovereignity. These are principles of traditional intergovernmental relations, against which no objection could be raised by any civilized government. But it is understood by all that it is impossible to build a government on the principles of the federal declaration. Exactly because of this there has been such a furious attack on the declaration and the principles of the declaration, and so the center and the inconsistent, or not entirely consistent representatives of the central power are here in the Ukraine, desperately opposing us.

Correspondent: Is it to be understood that RUKh is against strengthening interunion ties?

Ternopilski: We are not against the Ukraine's maintaining horizontal ties. Because of this, we welcome the signing of the intergovernmental treaty with Russia and other republics, but we consider that that was entirely sufficient. If the treaties which the Ukraine has entered into were to be generalized, if they were united into one political and economic document, then that would be something, shall we say, a treaty which defines the cooperation between independent governments. This does not mean that we have to put up borders, and put border guards at them. But there is no doubt that the people do not want to live in communal apartments with shared kitchens and shared closets. Everybody feels this and wants to be the master of their own property, to manage natural resources and to have their own culture.

Correspondent: The authors of the Novo-Ogarevo concept of the treaty argue that the project which they worked out answers the interests of all the republics....

Ternopilski: I feel that it is simply hostile to the interests of the Ukrainian people. There is one article in particular, on the superiority of Union laws. What does this mean for the Ukraine?

This means that the entire legislative work of the Ukrainian parliament was in vain, that all-union laws will have the greatest might on Ukrainian territory, which can at random change that which the Ukrainian parliament had done. Results of this work have already been noticed. The Novo-Ogarevo variant of the Union treaty leaves the Ukraine only minor possibilities. More specifically, already there can be no discussion on any sort of independence of sovereignity. It is possible only to independently fulfill the wishes of the central government, with weakened control from their side, shall we say. Under such conditions we would not have our own national money nor army. And with a single authority over the energy system, we cannot be insured against the probability of another Chernobyl. So I think that there is no way that we can agree to this variant of the Treaty. In general any treaty, good or bad, will somehow be a way of deceiving the people.

Correspondent: You speak of the possibilities of signing economic agreements among the republics and even of the possibility of economic and political unions. But the parliaments of Byelorussia, Russia, Uzbekistan and a row of other union republics have in fact already approved the Novo-ogaryovo variant of the Union Treaty. So with whom, going on your concept, will we be able to make such unions?

Ternopilski: If those eight republics want to have such relations among themselves, which result in the formation of one federation, then that is their affair. But the Ukraine can make one of many treaties with this new federation, made up of eight republics, and have excellent relations with the federation. But once again, the Ukraine is only able to enter into such a treaty once the new constitution of the Ukraine has been adopted.

Correspondent: Tell me please, how do you feel about the Higher Soviet's and its Chairman Leonid Kravchuk's acenting especially teh Ukraine's necessity of entering the Union on the principles of its declaration?

Ternopilski: Recently the words of Leonid Kravchuk have been heard with a certain interest. And very shortly we will have the opporunity to see what stands behind his words. If after words come actions, and these actions actually lead to the Ukraine's not wavering from the principles of the Declaration on governmental sovereignity by one iota, as Leonid Kravchuk has emphasized, then I think that he will find wide-ranging support from the population. But there is a peasant saying: Don't make a new man a shepherd. We have leaders who have held to one and the same views all their lives. For example, Levko Lukyanenko, who spent 27 years in concentration camps in the fight for independence, today still defends this idea. He is the Ukrainian Republican Party's candidate for the position of President of the Ukraine. I think it is more reliable to support such leaders, than, say, Leonid Kravchuk. I am sure, however, that the question of reaching Ukrainian independence calls us to forget about any political ambitions and to all unite.

Correspondent: And the last question. If we imagine a situation in which the parliament of our republic agrees to sign the Novo-Ogarevo variant of the Union treaty, how do you think the democratic forces of the Ukraine would react to this?

Ternopilski: There could be no circumstance in which the Ukrainian parliament would approve the project and agree to sign the treaty. And I think that we are supported by progressive forces in the parliament, and by the leadership of the republic, not to be brought to such a fate. We are planning a row of actions to unite, consolidate the Ukrainian people. In particular, we want to revive our ancient tradition of holding all folk counsels. And we want to call for an all-Ukrainian counsel on Sunday, the fifteenth of September, at our holy place—by Saint Sofia on Bogdana Khmelnitskogo Square. We want representatives from all parts of the Ukraine to gather there, from every village, from every productive collective. In a word, so that all caring citizens of the Ukraine joined and said a decisive "NO" to the Union treaty. It would take place on the eve of the first session of parliament, and I think that such unity should help parliament. To help them to take a resolution which would make it entirely impossible to sign the Novo-Ogaryovo variant of the Union treaty, which treaty contradicts the interests of the Ukraine and the Declaration on governmental sovereignity of the Ukraine.

An Interview With Georgiy Khoshtariya, Georgia's Minister Of Foreign Affairs, On Georgia's Foreign Policy

Correspondent: When do you think that discussions can start with the Center about the restoration of Georgia's independence?

Khoshtariya: With regard to Georgia, Zviad Gamsakhurdia has more than once announced his readiness to meet with the leaders of the Center. From the Center, however, we have not sensed this readiness. Generally, I would call the actions of the Center the cruel politics of twisting arms. This has been manifested by an economic blockade and through disinformation. I know of hundreds of examples in which businessmen refuse to have contact with us because they were told in Moscow that Georgia is dangerous and not worth it to travel there. You can say the same about the press. I am not saying that one cannot criticize us, but at least, there should be objective information, but often basic lies are printed.

Such a lie does not lead to anything good, only to confrontation, animosity, and mistrust.

Correspondent: What sort of relations do you have with foreign countries?

Khoshtariya: They have contact with us, without acknowledging our independence. On the whole, we have had meetings on an unofficial level with the second leaders of the foreign ministries of the U.S. and of France. In November we will already be having an official meeting with the minister of foreign affairs of Turkey. This wil be the first meeting on such a level. The President of Georgia is also planning an unofficial visit to the United States in the Autumn of this year.

Correspondent: In your opinion, how do you think Georgia's independence will be recognized by foreign countries?

Khoshtariya: I do not think that this will happen so soon, in any case, only after the Soviet Union and Russia have acknowledged us.

The complete coordination of actions between all the republics—those who voiced a desire to remain in the Union, and those who are not planning to sign the Union Treaty—will lead to Georgian independence quickest of all. This is because reaching sovereignity is a common principle for all republics. Georgia should walk in line with all the republics who are striving to increase their rights.

Correspondent: Has any sort of concept been developed to find independence for the republic?

Khoshtariya: At the moment we feel that Georgia is in a transitional period. Thus I would describe the essence of our concept as: take it step by step. We intend to have our own banks, our own hard currency, trade, and borders. But this will all be in stages. Up until now, confrontation has prevailed between the Center and Georgia. This, in my view, is a destructive path, which leads neither side to gain. It must be replaced with dialogue, the basis of which will be healthy sense and compromise.

Correspondent: You have mentioned border guards. In what way do you intend to introduce them?

Khoshtariya: In the beginning with neighboring republics. And bordering foreign countries, during the first stage we will most likely have a mixed guard—Georgian border guards and Union border guards. For today, I think that even these measures will be useful, in as much as they will help to regulate the chaos which exists now.

Correspondent: On what principles does an independent Georgia intend to build its relations with the USSR, and also with the republics which do not sign the Union treaty?

Khoshtariya: On the generally accepted principles of relations between countries. At their base are mutual geopolitical, economic and cultural interests. At any rate, we belong to one region, and experienced all of the hardships of the past seven decades together. It is distincly "fraternity through imprisonment." We are related, of course, in realizing our past, and economically we are no relatively the same level. All this impels us to establish close contacts. Naturally, Russia and the Transcaucassian republics hold a special place in this relationship. I think that after Georgia has received independence, she will find herself in a close political union with Russia. At the very least, in an economic and cultural sense this is a necessity.

With regard to the Center, I think it should transform itself in such a way as to become the coordinating structure, not the commanding structure. That is not necessary. Economically, politically, historically—it is an absolute anacronism.

Correspondent: We would you evaluate Georgia's relations with its neighbors, Azerbaijhan and Armenia?

Khoshtariya: Our main goal is to stabilize the situation in one of the most tense regions of the Soviet Union, the Transcaucussess. We are trying to bring peace to this region, peace which was destroyed as a result of the short-sightedness of Transcaucassian politics, which lead to the conflict. It seems to me that the Center urged them to do this. The treaties which Georgia recently signed with Azerbaijhan and Armenia, in my view, were the first step towards stabilizing the situation in the Transcaucasses.

Correspondent: Today it is possible to hear criticism of the leadership of Georgia, in particular of Gamzakhurdia. What do you think about this?

Khoshtariya: It is possible and essential to criticize us. But the criticism should be constructive. This criticism, which we are getting now, is built 90% on disinformation.

All of the arrested "political" prisoners are members of the armed organization "Mkhedrioni", which does not obey parliament. They attack the police. In another country they would simply be shot. In August, it is possible that there will already be a trial of the leader of "Mkhedrioni," Dzhaboy Iosiliani. There were a few thousand of them, but only the most active ones were arrested, the rest are free. They are all armed, but the weapons, most likely, have been hidden. And without concrete proof we are not allowed to arrest them, only for being members of "Mkhedrioni." The population would breathe more easily; more than bread, the people demand safety.

Regarding the accusation of falsification of the presidential voting results: international observers were present at the polls. 99% of them assert the fairness of the election. No documents of the opposition have been produced. Because of this, an electoral commission has the right to bring an action against Georgi Chanturia, one of the leaders of the opposition who accused us.

Privatisation In Kazakhstan Contradicts The Interests Of The Central Departments

The Kazakh parliament passed a law "to reform state property". This law provides the legal basis for the privatisation and denationalisation of state property in the republic, which has an estimated value of 160-165 million roubles. The enforcement of this law is hindered by two serious problems: the unwillingness of the Union's ministers to concede and the lack of money available to the overwhelming majority of the population.

"We will consider the scheme a success," said Sauk Takezhanov, head of the Commission for Economic Reform of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet, "if in the next 2-3 years we are able to transform 30

of the property." 2.5 million roubles are expected to be added to the republican budget from the sale of state property.

The new law makes a distinct definition between "denationalisation" IE. the transformation of state property into leased firms or firms under collective ownership and "privatisation" the sale of state property including shares in state firms, housing etc. to any juridical or non-juridical person. State firms, according to the law, are not entitled to take part in the privatisation.

According to specialists on the republic's Committee for State Property the greatest problem during the privatisation of property in Kazakhstan will be the division of property into union-owned, republic-owned and communal property.

The problem of union-owned property is not exclusive to Kazakhstan however; according to different sources in Kazakhstan union-owned industries constitute between 93% and 95% of all the republic's industry. The Soviet ministry has complete control over all the republic's most important export branches in industry ie. over the metallurgical, coal, oil and mining industries.

Another headache for the republic's powers is the process of spontaneous "privatisation" of union-owned firms by Soviet ministries and departments when a firm is transformed into leased societies and the responsible department has the controlling shares.

After the Kazakh Supreme Soviet's decision in April the Republican Commission for State Property received the right to question the decisions made by state organs, including union organs, "regarding the change in ownership rights of state property".

However, at present, that is before the Union treaty is signed, the republic's leaders consider that "a poor compromise is better than a huge argument" with the union's departments.

Over the last few months a few treaties on the limitation of power were signed between the republican government and the central ministries ie. with the ministries for geology, oil, gas and railways. The head of the Supreme Economic Soviet under the President of Kazakhstan, D. Sembayev, emphasised "We are not trying to create conflicts but are trying to solve the present situation through decisions." According to the agreement the republic now has the right to control part of the production potential of these Soviet ministries on its territory.

During privatisation or denationalisation any form of payment can be accepted including even valuable special state papers, coupons or certificates, exclusively named for the purchase of state property. According to one of the economic specialists for the President, N. Nezarbayev, Chan Yan Benga it is essential to use the coupon system, which takes into account a person's length of service and average wage, during the privatisation of state housing, the service industry and public catering.

The distinguishing feature of the republic's privatisation law is that it ensures complete equality for all juridical and private persons when buying state property, with the exception of foreigners and people without citizenship. However as Sauk Takezhanov said, "We realise that in the case of auctions or the free sale of property the involvement of foreign capital will be inevitable." In order to even out the chances of Soviet and foreign investors it is possible that the privatisation of state property will take place not at auctions but on a competitive basis, where the investors will be presented with a packet of obligations which they must fulfil.

The most interesting investments for foreigners would be the chemical and metallurgical industries according to specialists on the Committee for State Property: Ecological requirements in the USSR are considerably lower than in industrially advanced countries.

Further Remarks on Union Treaty

PM0908100491 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Aug 91 p 1

[Feature compiled by Ye. Dotsuk, O. Yegorova, G. Agisheva, U. Babakhanov, K. Markaryan, and K. Bayalinov: "Union Treaty: Sign Before It's Too Late. Everything Costs More Retail"]

[Text] **Kazakh President N. Nazarbayev**

The draft Union treaty was considered by a session of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. After making many constructive comments and suggestions, the republic's parliamentarians by and large supported its conceptual basis.

This political decision was dictated by at least three important factors. First, we based our decision on the will of the peoples of Kazakhstan, who unequivocally voiced their attitude to the renewed Union in the all-Union referendum. Second, we proceeded on the basis of the objective fact that our state, all its imperfections born of the totalitarian regime notwithstanding, constitutes a unified economic, social, and living space for millions of people, the destruction of which would undoubtedly represent an irreparable loss for us. Third, the new Union treaty is a direct way of really fleshing out our Declaration of State Sovereignty.

S. Bril, Deputy Chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers

We favor the Union treaty. Because the basis of the treaty—and I am firmly convinced of this—is above all economic and there is nothing for our country's economic managers to argue about—if of course they take a realistic look at the prevailing situation—agreement must be reached.

Belorussia is an "importer" republic for virtually all types of resources. What about the grief of Chernobyl? Can we really survive alone? Why then has the Union treaty still not been signed? Something absurd is happening in our country: Politicians have begun to interfere in the economic sphere and that is quite inadmissible.

M. Rakhimov, Chairman of the Bashkortostan Supreme Soviet

In the Bashkortostan declaration we proclaimed ourselves to be components of the Union and the renewed

Russia. Therefore the talk of supposedly seceding is groundless. But if we respect the renewed Russia, there must also be respect for the republics who have adopted declarations of state sovereignty.

We must therefore be founders of the Union treaty and sign it autonomously, as a sovereign state that is part of Russia, with a separate delegation.

K. Aslonov, Chairman of the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet

The republic's position on the future of the Union was clearly voiced in the results of the all-Union referendum—96 percent of its inhabitants favored a renewed Union. Guided by the will of the people, the Tajik parliament advocated signing the new Union treaty. We have raised this question twice for Supreme Soviet examination, discussed it in detail, and made our comments. Most of them have been taken into consideration in the final version of the treaty.

The idea that Tajikistan will vanish without the Union is a misconception. But only together will we be able to create a supremely effective economic mechanism and build a democratic rule-of-law society with the fewest problems.

D. Ivans, First Deputy Chairman Of The Latvian Supreme Soviet

Our viewpoint has not changed. We will not sign the so-called Union treaty. Although we are of course willing to sign a treaty recognizing our independence and on future relations with the USSR. We are awaiting the results of the Novo-Ogarevo process because this will somewhat clarify the situation.

At present the situation is vague. According to some things that the Soviet leaders have said, after the Union Treaty has been signed the USSR's relations with the Baltic countries will be structured as they are with foreign countries. However, I have great suspicions in actual fact that the proclaimed attitude toward us as foreign states will manifest itself not in serious talks on independence but in economic and political pressure.

As for hope, it consists in the fact that Russian President Yeltsin is taking part in the treaty. I think that he can somehow influence the "Nine" to ensure that they settle questions of relations with neighboring states in a civilized manner.

Kyrgyz Vice President G. Kuznetsov

We are prepared to sign the treaty 20 August. The republic's parliament has accorded us the relevant powers for this. I would like to point out at this juncture that the treaty itself will not contravene the declaration of Kyrgyz state sovereignty, therefore there will be no obstacles on our part.

United Democratic Party Hopefuls' Appeal

914B0260A Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Jul 91 p 2

["APPEAL for the Formation a National United Democratic Party" published under the rubric "Published by way of advertisement"]

[Text] The country is tired of waiting either for radical changes or a return to the past. People are being intimidated from both the left and the right with civil war and dictatorship.

At the same time the policy of national and civic harmony, which we uphold, is beginning to win the ever increasing support of the masses. The democratic community has not supported tactics of total confrontation, the incitement of political passions and political risk at the expense of the people's security. This policy emanates primarily from the CPSU and its republic detachments, which are rapidly becoming revanchist parties.

Considerable numbers of the peoples of the USSR have opted for the form of the Union as a unity of free sovereign states. Under these conditions we consider the main task of the democratic forces to be the further democratization of the new Union.

Only by way of the democratization of the center is it possible to accelerate structural reforms and the liberation of the whole country and its republics from the totalitarian regime. Only by way of a renewal of the center and the entire system of state power is it possible to achieve a normalization of the situation in the country and to ensure for each individual security, sufficiency, and faith in the future. National independence and freedom also may be obtained only in a free state.

Today we do not see a more important, vital task than preparation for the elections to the Union organs of state power and the creation of a government of civil accord capable of freeing the country from its totalitarian legacy.

Only a strong political organization formed as a result of the unification of the democratic forces on the scale of the republics and the whole country can accomplish this historic task. What can be done today it will not be possible to do tomorrow. The time for half-measures in the form of the organization of movements or temporary alliances is past. They engender internal contradictions and squabbles. At every step the struggle of ideas and programs is being replaced by a struggle of leaders.

We need a constructive opposition capable of formulating a program of radical, practicable reforms comprehensible to the people and enjoying their trust. We need a constructive opposition capable of presenting a unified list of candidates for the power structures of the new Union and of persuading people to vote for them, not for a new democratized echelon of the old official party appointments roster.

We need a strong political party with discipline based on conviction, with structures capable of interacting between themselves and as a whole. This will be a party not for the political exercises of its members and unintelligible talk about the advantages of one direction of democracy or another. We are not interested today in constitutional, liberal, Christian, conservative, and social democratic nuances. God grant that we may uphold and build democracy itself in society. It is on this level that we view the party which is being formed as a party of the transitional period.

What kind of structure it will have and how the various platforms will be reflected in it will be decided by a unifying congress, which we propose convening no later than September 1991. It is clear merely that in respect of the republics it will be built on a confederal basis.

We must be an action party from the first steps. In the regions where the democrats have won we will be a party of the acceleration of reforms. We want to accelerate the country's liberation from all that prevents people living and working normally and feeling themselves to be free.

In the regions where power is held, as before, by the orthodox from the CPSU we will play the part of political opposition. We will struggle against the monopoly of power, property, and people's thoughts and feelings.

The party locally will be the initiator of the creation of charity foundations and will do everything possible to make life easier for people incapable of protecting themselves.

We all sense that a transformation of the CPSU is being prepared, and before we are packed into some new movement, democratic, but harmful to the system, we should form a party rapidly. It is essential to this end to take as a basis the ready-made structures of the parties of a democratic focus in the republics and conduct unifying congresses locally. To elect authoritative leaders.

We appeal to the members of our parties—you should not attempt to preserve your tiny political niches: We have nothing to divide up. We are obliged to unite and become strong.

We appeal to people with an active position in life who are members of no parties and who are allergic to the very word "party": No one will do anything for us—unite. Unite, despite your allergy, if only for your children's sake. Let us do our bit for them—let us draw a line beneath the communist experiment in our country.

We appeal to members of the CPSU who are still hesitating and not quitting its ranks. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has done all it could have done for our country. It has reduced people to poverty, brought the economy to the end of its tether, and reduced nature to ecological catastrophe. Time to stop believing in it, perhaps? Leave it and join with us.

We appeal to the workers movement—it is essential to become politicized and not remain aloof. Only by implementing political reforms can we move from standstill in the economy. No general political strike will change our life for the better—[begin bold]they[end bold] have sufficient stocks of food for any strike, and as a result the only ones exchanging blows will be **us.**

We appeal to the intelligentsia. Do not remain observers in white coats. Determine your position. Did you learn nothing from the history of the "children of the sixties"?

We appeal particularly to the youth and the students. Enough of sleeping. All that is being done today, both right and wrong, is for you. It will be for you to either continue things or disentangle and refashion them. So become involved, and let us work together.

We appeal to the collectives of state-owned enterprises, to co- operators and entrepreneurs and, simply, to the citizens of our country—a powerful party cannot be created at the amateur level, help us materially.

Our account is DPR [Democratic Party of Russia] 700013 Avtobank Acct, #299112, Moscow Finance Department USSR State Bank Central Oblast Administration 299112.

And in conclusion. We have little social and political experience. We have never engaged in party building. We are clearly aware that the names of those calling for the creation of a national United Democratic Party are not so well known that you will believe unconditionally in its success. But we are not offering ourselves as leaders—we are proposing unification in an organization in order to win together. The sole thing we guarantee is the sincerity of our intentions, the honesty of our actions and a tremendous desire to make life better for the individual in our country.

Address of the organizing committee for the formation of a United Democratic Party: 8, Shabolovka Street, Moscow 117049. Tel: 236-80-67, 237-67-63.

Academician S. Shatalin, chairman of the DPR Advisory-Political Council

N. Travkin, chairman of the DPR, people's deputy of the USSR and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]

Sh. Yusupov, chairman of the Democratic Party of Tajikistan

D. Khodzha-Mukhammed, co-chairman of the Democratic Party of Turkmenia

V. Davituliani, people's deputy of the USSR, member of the Social Democratic Party of Russia

E. Kovrigin, co-chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Russia social-liberal faction

A. Repnikov, member of the Russian Trade Union Federation

A. Krichevskiy, member of the Russian Trade Union Federation

N. Bogayenko, member of the Russian Trade Union Federation, people's deputy of the RSFSR

The parties of the "National Harmony" bloc consider the formation of the United Democratic Party [UDP] a vitally important task and are prepared to support the formation of the UDP in every possible way. Only a mass democratic party operating on the scale of the whole country could become the basis of constructive democratic forces, a bloc capable of uniting broad strata of society for the complete victory of democracy in the next Union elections.

Russian Christian Movement, V. Aksyuchits, chairman of the Political Council, people's deputy of the RSFSR

Constitutional Democratic Party (Popular Freedom Party), M. Astafyev, chairman of the Central Committee, people's deputy of the RSFSR

AN-74 Awarded Airworthiness Certificate

LD0808181491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0955 GMT 8 Aug 91

[By Valentin Vernodubenko]

[Excerpts] Kiev 8 Aug (TASS)—An airworthiness certificate for the multi-purpose AN-74 aircraft, developed by Kiev designers, was presented today at the Oleg Antonov scientific-technical aviation complex. This means elimination of all restrictions on serial production and commercial sales, including sales abroad, for the unique air transport, which has successfully passed trials in virtually all climatic zones, including the extreme conditions of the Arctic and Antarctic. [passage omitted]

"The gaining of the certificate is a great success for our team", Petr Balabuyev, the scientific-technical aviation complex's general designer told the correspondent. "Suffice it to say that altogether four aircraft in the country have such a document—the IL-62, the YAK-42, and two of ours, the AN-28, and now the AN-74. A brief description of the new machine: Two engines enable it to gather a speed of up to 700 km per hour and deliver 1.5 tonnes of cargo over a distance of 4,300 km. It can also carry passengers. Several aviation plants in the country are to begin producing the AN-74 at the same time, something unprecedented in our practice. To this end, an association has been formed, including three aviation assembly works—in Ukraine, Siberia and the far east, and also the engine plant and design bureau in Zaporozhye and a number of enterprises and organizations. They will insure the development of production of our innovation on a short timescale and in large numbers. Orders for the new plane already exceed 1,500. The Yakut Civil Aviation Directorate alone would like to buy 120 to 150. There will also be considerable demand for them abroad. We plan to produce several modifications of the new machine. We already have blueprints for an aircraft which is able to carry passengers in one direction and carry cargo containers in the return direction, after quickly folding the seats away. We have not looked for easy solutions, but have tried to create an aircraft that satisfies all the strict world standards of flight safety, and we have succeeded."

The Kiev aircraft designers are now faced with the task of developing another new product—the AN-218. They plan to get a certificate for it in 1996 and to commence commercial sales.

TASS Reviews 9 Aug Soviet Central Press

LD0908071691 Moscow TASS in English 0644 GMT 9 Aug 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—National newspapers today published the draft programme of the Soviet Communist Party titled "Socialism, Democracy, Progress."

Newspapers report that in keeping with the decision of the July plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee and the commission that was set up to prepare the programme, the draft is put to discussion in all party organisations. Once the discussion is over, the draft programme will be examined by the CPSU extraordinary congress. It is stressed that the discussion is meant to help elaborate realistic programme goals, consolidate the party ranks and renew the CPSU's entire activity.

In this regard, PRAVDA printed a large editorial titled "For the Realism of Political Actions." It emphasises that the programme, which will absorb the wealth of thoughts, experience and the analysis of modern realities during the discussion in party organisations, should become an ideological foundation for the consolidation of communists and all supporters of the socialist choice.

PRAVDA points out that the draft of the new programme proceeds from the confidence that the CPSU is capable of carrying through genuine renewal and idelogically consolidating its ranks on the basis of profound democratisation.

Will bread be in ample supply in the country this year? PRAVDA's correspondent I. Totskiy put this question to M.L. Timoshishin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Purchase of Food Resources. "All depends on how the country will cope with harvesting and procurement," he answered. Timoshishin laments that the pace at which grain is being stored up is vastly lower than last year. He said farms were in no hurry to turn over grain to the state. Only 19 million tonnes of grain were supplied to state storages, although the state order for the sale of grain was fixed at 77 million tonnes.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN writes that farms "are turning their back on grain storages" because farmers do not trust the present agrarian policy in the country. Much more is taken away from them today than is supplied, the newspaper stresses.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA features a report from the fields of the Borets collective farm, where work to take in the harvest is going full steam ahead.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA published an appeal by the Central Control Commission of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee to all communists of the Russian Federation in connection with the Russian president's decree to halt the activity of the organisational structures of the political parties and mass public movements in state bodies, institutions and organisations of the Russian Federation.

The commission believes that the decree aims at separating the party from the work collectives which are thus denied an effective influence on the elaboration and implementation of the state's socio-economic policy.

PRAVDA's political news analyst Tomas Kolesnichenko analyses Soviet-U.S. relations in the light of U.S. President George Bush's recent visit to the Soviet Union. He contends that the policy of new thinking bears its fruits: The U.S. is changing its strategy. The revision of the U.S. military strategy is just beginning, which enables us to draw far-reaching conclusions, he writes.

Judging by statements made by U.S. leaders, one can draw the conclusion that political changes on the international scene also set in motion military-strategic changes. At point is not the superiority of one camp over another but the emergence of a totally different situation where confrontation gives way to cooperation between the USSR and the U.S.

The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper, organ of the Soviet Defence Ministry, has a different point of view on this score. Its commentator Aleksandr Golts considers the development of Soviet-U.S. relations from the point of view of partnership in solving many international problems. "Are we partners?" he queries. Each time cooperation is discussed, the U.S. side puts forward conditions to us, demanding concessions. The commentator believes that equal partnership in the modern-day world is possible only between equal partners. "To our great regret, we are not an equal partner to the U.S. It is time for us to elaborate a clear criterium that would allow us to approach any international situation from the point of view of our national interests," the commentator writes.

PRAVDA describes the Soviet-U.S. statement containing the proposal to convene a peace conference on the Middle East in October as the first step towards a Middle East settlement. PRAVDA's correspondent in Beirut A. Stepanov analyzes the parties' positions and the alignment of forces at the forthcoming talks. He point out that the position of Israel, which is prepared to conduct talks with Arab countries on the basis of the "peace in exchange for peace" principle harbours contradictions.

Newspapers continue to give broad coverage to developments in Yugoslavia. PRAVDA writes that although an agreement on the absolute and unconditional cease-fire was signed, it certainly does not solve all problems.

President of the Serbian Assembly (parliament) Aleksandr Bakocevic analyses the situation in his country in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. In an interview with NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY, he contends that "repartition in such a country as ours, where people and ethnic groups are mixed, is a disastrous undertaking. The right to self-determination is not the right of separate republics, but the "right of people. Therefore, Serbia is against unilateral decision by Slovenia and Croatia."

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reports about the killing of a fighter of the Croatian National Guard—the first victim after the announced cease-fire. [words indistinct] guns do not want to be silent," the newspaper points out.

Economic

Denationalization Law Enters Into Effect 7 Aug

LD0708173291 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 7 Aug 91

[Text] This legislation provides for denationalizing businesses to pave the way for free enterprise and form an effective market economy. From now on, state-run factories can be owned by any Soviet or foreign citizens. Almost anyone in the USSR will be able to acquire a certain part of the shares of such enterprises free.

The law will make it possible to eliminate within the next few years the main obstacle to a free market—state monopoly domination in all industries and services.

Gorbachev Consumer Decree Sets 'Modest' Goals

PM0708151591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Article by V. Romanyuk: "Immediate Measures in Consumer Market. What Will the New Presidential Decree Offer"]

[Text] The current state of our economy is one of unstable equilibrium in which the "bottom" has seemingly already been reached and a movement toward stabilization and growth is possible. But it is impossible to achieve this in all areas at once. The presidential decree, which defined immediate measures to increase the production of goods and services for the population, has outlined priorities and the very first and really achievable options for extricating the country from the crisis—in conditions of transition to the market. Not allowing a further decline in this most important sphere, which affects every Soviet person's everyday cares, and moreover trying to radically improve the situation in the consumer market—this is the aim that is being set. The aim, incidentally, stems from the joint action program of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and sovereign republic governments.

If the activities of the previous government and the current cabinet are analyzed, this sphere has not been starved of attention. In recent years numerous incentives and privileges for commodity producers have been introduced. Specifically, a procedure was operating under which payment to the budget decreased by 1 percent for every 1 percent of increase in consumer articles (above the 4-percent normal current growth). The proportion of profit being channeled into creating new capacities for the output of consumer articles is not taxable.

It is not difficult, however, to notice that many incentives are simply not "working" at the moment: According to the results for the first six months of 1991, we do not have growth but a drop against the corresponding period last year: By 8.5 percent in food products, by 10 percent in light industry, and only in cultural and consumer goods has it been possible to maintain last year's level. So, what new elements does the USSR president's decree offer?

N. Smetanin, chief of the USSR Ministry of Economics and Forecasting Consolicated department for the Production of Goods and services, sees the fundamental point as being that additional incentives are obtained by those who produce and deliver material and technical resources for the consumer industry. Moreover, deliveries of raw and other materials and of components for consumer goods workshops and the services sector must be guaranteed on a priority basis irrespective of fulfillment of commitments to deliver resources for the production of output for production and technical purposes.

The same goes for our scant foreign currency resources, including credits. Likewise they are channeled on a priority basis into procuring and paying for imported deliveries of both grain and medicines and of raw and other materials essential for the output of goods in popular demand. Barter operations associated with deliveries of both raw materials and finished goods are once again being restored and stepped up; preferential terms are being created for the import of consumer goods and the equipment used in their production. While preserving, however, restrictions on the import of luxury items and other articles not geared toward popular demand.

Summarizing all the measures laid down in the presidential decree, we will note this: The goals it sets are modest. But really achievable and socially oriented. The point is to stabilize the situation in the consumer market through the efforts of the center and the republics. It will be more complex to achieve this in light industry; it will be more practicable to achieve it in the production of complex domestic equipment. The well-known problems are associated with the process of ruble convertibility, which could lead to an increase in the prime cost of output. In Smetanin's opinion, implementation of the decree on immediate measures to increase the output of goods and services will enable the average daily level—of 1990—to be reached by mid-1992. Of course, this is not movement backward but the way toward stabilization and an attempt to break loose from the grip of the crisis.

Future of Tengiz-Chevron Oil Deal Assessed

91UF1040A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 1 Aug 91 p 2

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA special correspondent M. Ivanov: "Tengiz: The Underpinnings of a Scandal"]

[Text] Guryev-Moscow—**For decades, they did not allow us to touch "the secret kitchen" of foreign economic transactions with a 10-foot pole. Those who tried "to overstep the bounds" really caught it. By now, certain things are leaking to the press. However, it is virtually more difficult to judge what is what. For example, recently a shout highly favored by the "right" was heard from the "left" window for the entire country to hear concerning the well-know Tengiz:**

"Help! They are robbing the country!"

It is known who is—the damned capitalists.

Briefly, the essence of the sensation is as follows: The joint enterprise Tengizchevroil, which is being set up using the facilities of the Tengizneftegaz Production Association, with the participation of the American company Chevron, supposedly amounts to an unequal deal: Basically, our largest oil field will be "plundered" by imperialists, and it is necessary for a prosecutor to intervene. This conclusion is based on the findings of a commission of four specialists headed by Ye. Gaydar. Despite the fact that this assertion is highly controversial (in particular, President of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev stated directly: Specialists from the republic worked on the draft contract for three years, whereas the four, having "studied" everything in one week, have made the fuss subjectively), details concerning "the denunciatory investigation" continued to snowball.

Is yet another "robbery of the century" a threat to our country, following the ANT [Automation, Science, and Technology] affair? I approached competent individuals for explanations regarding this. Yu. Shcherbina, first deputy chairman of the board and first deputy general director of the Soviet Foreign Economic Consortium (SVK), categorically disagreed with the accusations:

"As any document in preparation, the draft agreement does not suit us entirely as well. We are continuing to coordinate positions on a number of issues. However, we cannot cast slurs upon the work done in a wholesale manner! I am not going to deny that the authors of 'the noises off stage' in the Tengiz affair have quoted many facts which are apparently correct, but look at how they are 'packaged.'

"In all honesty, we are much more likely to waste Tengiz if we keep going through the motions of its development 'on our own.' Those who have seen up close the hell-fires of the open fountain erupting for 14 months at Well 37 (and, incidentally, put out with the help of the same Americans) cannot think otherwise."

Shcherbina went on to say: "Of course, the draft of the joint enterprise Tengizchevroil could be more advantageous for us. However, it is equally obvious that excessive indecision regarding the choice of partners may also do us in. Tengiz urgently needs a different level of technology: Let us begin with, say, the drilling of local ultradeep wells, into which we are forced to lower casings in segments rather than in one piece because of the low capacity of the equipment. The casings are screwed together unseen, somewhere in the lower horizons. As a result, it is not certain that they are entirely hermetic (To be sure, quite a few of our oil men would not admit to it: Is this about professional honor?). Only God knows what this can bring about. We also need another standard of organization. How much longer can we go on like this?—a while ago, we brought in several imported sets of production lines for Tengiz, as if in their absence there would be nothing to eat or drink. We are now letting them age like vintage wine. Now, years later, we are barely getting around to starting up the first line, having stripped assemblies and parts for putting it together from virtually all the remaining lines: One thing has gone bad, another has burned down together with the warehouse, and yet another has 'evaporated' to God-knows-where.... This start-up is by no means a cake walk either....

"Finally, we have an urgent need for qualitatively new personnel training. After all, in this pursuit we have so far been unable to 'outdo' our system. This is almost as frightening as taking on a lion with a toothpick."

Well, the manager of a foreign economic establishment is correct. All of this is all the more topical because the "locomotive" of the development of Tengiz, which at one time was picking up speed, is about to come to a halt with no slots left in the timetable. I say this based on firsthand experience—I visited the oil field myself.

Viktor Begin, chairman of Guryev Oblispolkom [oblast executive committee], told me: "According to the most conservative calculations, the 'conquerors' of the oil giant will need 1.3 billion rubles [R] this year. We understand that financing in our country is out of whack, but this gives us no solace. Only after a direct appeal to Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] President Nursultan Nazarbayev, who in turn approached Mikhail Gorbachev directly, Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov announced the allocation of R770 million for the needs of Tengiz. However, we have not seen even these funds yet. How will it end? The Tengizneftegaz Production Association is still afloat somehow due to selling extra-balance oil, but the main construction trusts which operate at the oil field itself and develop the base city of Kulsary are falling apart before our very eyes."

Viktor Ivanovich went on to say: "We cannot stand idly by and wait until the funds are finally procured somewhere, or until a truly 'kind capitalist uncle' is found abroad. An oil field is not a coal strip mine: A horizon should be worked once opened; otherwise, all the work done may be wasted. The ecological risk is also greater if we begin to 'drag our feet.' On the other hand, there is a great deal that still needs to be invested here! Transportation thoroughfares for shipping out products are a field yet untouched. What about the subsequent processing of raw materials? For example, the concept of building the giant enterprise Tengizpolimer, set forth in his time by the late Armand Hammer, 'perished' before it was born due specifically to our incomparable foreign economic strategy: One potato, two potato... profitable it is, profitable it isn't...."

What about the "one-sided" nature of the forthcoming transaction with Chevron? After all, as one comrade put it, capitalists have shown greater leniency even toward the aborigines!

Begin said: "The truth is always specific. Naturally, dividends secured by owners will be different in places where the oil found is not so deep. Meanwhile, in all these years we have not even been able to touch the bottom of the producing horizon with a drill bit. They will be different where first-class thoroughfares or ocean lanes are nearby, and where perfidious and extremely dangerous hydrogen sulfide is absent, and finally, where the political situation is stable and the economic legislation is 'workable,' due to which foreign investors do not run the risk of being left holding the bag."

For my part, I will add that, of course, an opportunity for a more advantageous contract was not ruled out. However, was it all that likely?

Competent specialists at the SVK explained: There is quite a distance between preliminary negotiations and specific transactions, in conjunction with which comprehensive economic studies are carried out. Therefore, substantial advantages due to changing partners are not to be expected. At the same time, new studies would take another two to three years. Can we afford this? Is there a reason for us to hope to see foreign companies falling all over themselves in their desire to shower us with their charity?

The answer could not be any clearer. We have lived to see the day when apprenticing ourselves to capitalists has become an issue of self-preservation. There is no way to maintain our socialist innocence while at the same time acquiring contemptible capital. Poor Tengiz! What else is there to do? If we do not reach for the last resort, we may not live to see our progeny.

Current discussions about Tengiz also have other underpinnings. You must have noticed: As soon as the issue of any structure other than an all-state one entering the foreign market is raised realistically, a genie of scandal pops out either from the right or left corner, as if out of a bottle. This person is "ours," this one—"not ours..." Is not the essence basically the same? This time, as well, the fuss has been kicked up supposedly because of local movers and shakers, but in the opinion of experienced commentators, the blow was aimed at none other than the USSR president, who apparently signed the original document in America....

The aforementioned Yuriy Shcherbina assured me: "I state categorically that Gorbachev has not endorsed any documents on Tengiz. However, as we know, he definitely supports the concept of cooperating with the Americans. How could it be otherwise, since at issue is not just oil production, but the creation of an entire system of economic structures, the objective of which is to accelerate the production of goods and medical preparations of an international standard and to cure the Soviet market. Many American companies are prepared to vigorously participate in this, provided that they do not find this business to be too risky because of the current critics from the left.... To be sure, what kind of 'left' is it? Personally, I view this as an attempt by 'specialists' from one of the structures of the former USSR State Planning Committee to blow their own horn as a result of the scandal, and 'stay afloat' under the new conditions for economic operations due to this...."

While pondering all of this, I encountered a curious document in Guryev. It suggests that the case of the notorious Well 37 in Tengiz has not been closed at all, and that it is not ruled out that undesirable physical processes are underway in the well which may bring about the formation of springs. Let me explain: This happens when the contents of the producing horizon burst outside the cased well, in this case, under pressure of about 1,000 atmospheres, and spiced with hydrogen sulfide, to boot. Nobody from among the people I have asked has been able to say whether "our people" will be able to handle this kettle of fish. Are we going to wait?

Problems Facing Joint Ventures Viewed

PM0808160091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

["Statistics and Our Commentary" article by V. Romanyuk: "'Window' on an Open Economy?"]

[Text] The other day IZVESTIYA printed a cartoon: A Red Army soldier in a helmet and a bourgeois in a top hat, with a cigar between his teeth, are walking arm in arm, exchanging friendly smiles. The caption reads: "Up with the joint enterprise!" Very funny. But it is true that the joint enterprise is the way to an open economy, a means of attracting foreign capital. The internationalization of production is taking place throughout the world, and our state ownership has proved less flexible and less adapted to competition. Incidentally, world giants can only be successfully opposed by powerful structures able to attract foreign capital.

Can we do this? How can I put it... Soviet partners are trying to increase exports, but the Western market is already saturated. It is another matter when joint enterprises help to increase the technological standard of production in general and assimilate advanced technologies. We have enormous untapped potential in the form of inventions. We know of a case where the Japanese sought access to designs rejected by our own departments. We ourselves do not find them very tempting: In 70 out of 100 cases the introduction of new technology means foreign technology, and not necessarily always advanced technology.

But here is another fact. For profitable [pribylnyy] operation, for a joint enterprise in Western Europe a profit margin [rentabelnost] of 35-40 percent is sufficient, in China 50 percent, and in our country—more than 100 percent. Those are the statistics. The difficult conditions of existence of joint enterprises, among other things, are making them seek various opportunities for diversification. A. Girenko, director of the "Naftam" joint enterprise, has described this as a means of survival. His network of daughter enterprises—in transportation, tourism, agro-industry, banking—ensures that the system as a whole "keeps afloat."

Foreign investors demand guarantees, and not only in Moscow, but on the periphery too. And since there are no guarantees there, half of the joint enterprises have been founded... in the capital. I have become familiar with the activity of the Soviet-Swiss joint enterprise "Serveco." My acquaintance with it began with the detention of components from the Swiss partners at customs at Sheremetyevo-2 airport. The cargo was eventually released, but considerable time had been lost. Then they tried without success to register subsidiaries of the joint enterprise at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, and engaged in a dispute with departments that were trying to sever the enterprise's links with the outside world. I realized that you need monstrous penetrating power and resilience to survive in this savage market.

But let us go back to statistics. As of 1 April 1991, according to USSR State Committee for Statistics figures, 3,400 joint enterprises were registered in the country. But only one-fourth of them had produced anything or provided any services. In the first quarter, output worth 2.3 billion rubles [R] was produced. Compared with the same period last year the increase is impressive (practically fourfold), but given the modest starting conditions these crumbs are not making any significant contribution to boosting the market.

Our joint enterprises are, as a rule, small enterprises—both in terms of volume of production and in terms of manpower. More than half of them are small in general, employing up to 50 people, and their output and services account for something like 16 percent of this sector of the economy. Those that are large in terms of manpower include joint enterprises like "Lenvest" with 2,700 people, "Komtee" with 2,700, and "Interkovent" with 2,600. The 15 or so large joint enterprises account for one-third of all work and services produced at enterprises of this kind. For instance, at "Lenvest" the volume of production in the first quarter was R37 million, "Belvest" produced output worth 44 million, and the "Moda" joint enterprise subsidiary produced output worth 97 million.

Joint enterprises began with the computer business, which is prospering to this day. But apart from computer equipment and spare parts, joint enterprises are producing sewn goods, furniture, footwear, telephone equipment, dry-cleaning machines, and much else. Nearly one-fourth of all their sales in rubles still consisted of computer equipment, followed by cars, leather footwear, cosmetics, detergents, leather goods, and printed output.

Strange as it may seem, services as yet account for an insignificant proportion (12 percent of all sales, in rubles). These are mainly services associated with the installation and servicing of computer equipment; hotel, commercial, and transportation services; advertising; and the printing of books and brochures. Some 30 million foreign currency rubles were brought in by the sale of output for foreign currency on the Soviet market.

Unfortunately the structure of export and import operations is far from in our favor as yet. Given that in 1990 import purchases were three times as much as exports, and in 1991 they were twice as much, can we say that the situation has changed dramatically for the better? Hardly. As before, exports have a raw materials bias: One-fourth of all deliveries were accounted for by fish and sea food (when there is no fresh fish on sale!), 11 percent by sawn lumber and the same percentage by chemical goods and fertilizers, 9 percent by petroleum and petroleum products, and 7 percent by nonferrous metals and scrap. Two-thirds of exports by joint enterprises consisted of deliveries to Japan, the FRG, Italy, and Austria. Not very reassuring....

Today we are reaping the results of an unreasonable policy on joint enterprises. From the outset we put a kind of brake on Western business, fearing that they would "get rich" at our expense. But in the West today it is easier to start an enterprise than to get a job. And there is no paradox there. If you want to get work, you are claiming a job and social benefits. If you open even a small firm, you are creating new jobs yourself. In Western countries there is no special legislation on joint enterprises—everyone works under the national system; the activity of "our own" and "foreign" firms is regulated by the ordinary national legislation and international agreements of the country in question. What about us?

Mario Germondari, director of the Soviet-Italian joint enterprise "Antarex S.U.," told me that matters are delayed most of all by the need endlessly to ask for licenses to move materials across the border. In any country the state has just one concern: Pay your taxes and make a profit. What about our taxes? All you can do is increase costs and raise prices. The foreigner in Moscow is also worried by the fact that there is no extensive market for buildings, without which business simply has nowhere to take root; the movement of manpower from other countries and regions is ruled out. Many foreigners use joint enterprises solely as a way of selling something to the Union.

True, we have adopted the necessary legislative acts to protect foreign investments. The question today is how to create a solid infrastructure for joint entrepreneurship. At one conference this example was cited: It took all of two months for Tokyo and Okhotsk to settle their accounts. We are nervous and perplexed: Why are Western investors reluctant? They are frightened by instability in the economy and the lack of a market infrastructure. And we should not be in such a hurry to close those joint enterprises where the foreign partner is slow to contribute foreign currency.

The foreigners are holding back their main capital (and they are entitled to!), confining themselves to investing within the limits of marketing services—$3-5 million, and are even ready to write this off in the event of failure. These are "trial balloons," nothing more. Business will begin later. When? Well, maybe when the foreign partners become clear about our "rules of the game." If, say, we propose that they invest 50 percent of the capital, they should have the opportunity to estimate the real value of our share of the property, especially when it is a question of new forms—leasing, joint-stock companies, concessions. And that is what will determine the civilized nature of the economy.

Democratic Reform Movement Economic Plan Viewed

914A1014A Moscow DELOVOY MIR in Russian 24 Jul 91 p 2

[Article by Nikolay Andreyev: "A Market Without Democracy Is Very Dangerous": "And Democracy Without a Market Is Doomed"]

[Text] **When some party is formed, a public movement emerges or a debating club simply takes shape, its participants begin as the first matter of business to discuss how to behave in respect of the economy. Because any political force, however small, will insist on its right to lay claim to power. And power in our country is almost inevitably connected with the possibility of implementing economic transformations. Or, the other way about: erecting dependable barriers in its way, for which, for example, figures of the Russian Communist Party are incessantly being cursed.**

What can we expect from the Movement for Democratic Reforms, about whose birth so much had been said and which has now, finally, become a fact? It is, after all, a question of a party, which its initiators, A. Volskiy, N.

Petrakov, G. Popov, A. Rutskoy, I. Silayev, A. Sobchak, S. Shatalin, and E. Shevardnadze, do not try to hide. In September they intend to convene a constituent conference to unite the democratic forces, whose finale would be the creation of a strong party comparable in terms of power to the CPSU.

It is difficult, in fact, to speak of a clear economic program of the movement. Everything is yet at the level of slogans and wholly nonbinding appeals. Examples from the Appeal: "Land to the peasant. For the worker, appropriately paid labor, making him the proprietor of associated plants and factories." Well put, but too general. Or "In terms of its economic aspirations the movement professes freedom in economics, the diversity and equality of forms of ownership, consistent denationalization and privatization, free enterprise, given effective mechanisms of social protection, demilitarization of society and the economy, parliamentary control over defense, and the creation of the conditions maximally conducive to working and earning freely and living a well-to-do life worthy of man." For a person of liberal beliefs this sentence appears attractive, although, understandably, its composition required neither time nor an expenditure of mental energy—it slid from the pen of its own accord. And in the interview of the initiators of the movement the economic program shows through as the Statue of Liberty on a foggy day.

This is explicable. The main thing for the movement as yet is amassing political capital and gathering beneath its banners politically significant personalities of our society. And the second important point for the movement is formalization organizationally. There is not that much time left until September, and in order to assemble a constituent conference it will be necessary to expend considerable energy, and resources also, incidentally. But there is as yet no certainty, meanwhile, as to what the movement's financial base is. My attempts to ascertain this were unsuccessful. It is a generally well-known law here: Tell me where you got your money, and I will set forth your political and economic program.

At the same time the economic profile of the future party (we will call this new force emerging in the political arena this) is showing through perfectly clearly. Showing through clearly because there are no enigmas in the economic views of the founding fathers. They are all firm marketeers. Who today is not, for that matter. Only the most orthodox communists from the so-called Bolshevist Platform inspired by the chemist Nina Andreyeva still do not utter this word. All the rest, including even I. Polozkov, handle this concept easily and unconstrainedly. They are still by force of inertia frightening the people with the market, it is true, but they generally agree with its inevitable advent on sinful Soviet land. As for G. Popov or S. Shatalin—for them the market is the desired element.

But being a marketeer is easy in theory, and this is a suitable image for a mass meeting. But in practice it appears as a monster or caricature character. Having come to head the Moscow authorities, G. Popov has seen this for himself. Who does not recall his striking and furious protests against the administrative command system! With what a thrill his articles on this subject, when perestroyka was in its infancy, were read. No one was surprised, therefore, that when Popov became chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, the first thing he did was to start to talk about privatization, private trade, and payment for each and everything. And the result? Actions in the spirit of a totalitarian regime: demolition of the co-operators' stalls. Something similar, incidentally, has been done by the Gamsakhurdia regime in Tbilisi: all stalls of individuals will be swept from the face of the Georgian earth.

G. Popov, like another initiator of the new party, A. Sobchak, knows what it feels like to put theory into practice. They realized sooner than others that having democratic intentions is allowed and is very honorable, but that on assuming office it is necessary to operate by no means by democratic methods. It has become clear to them that an unstable political situation is death for democracy. And it cannot be stable until the time of an efficient economy arrives. A stable system means a stable economy. And vice versa.

I speak in somewhat more detail than is necessary in these remarks about G. Popov for the reason that the main danger which lies in wait for the new party is the incommensurability of the declarations on economic subjects and reality. Our chaotic reality is confounding and refuting the soundest theoretical premises. As a Saltykov-Shchedrin character said, "what is good for the German is death for us." And the most convincing arguments from others' experience do not help. Perhaps the sloganeering nature of the initiators' appeal is explained by the fact that they are endeavoring to influence the emotional side of human nature and are shunning cold calculation.

Nonetheless, it may be concluded that the future party, despite the unintelligibility of its economic platform, has every chance of becoming firmly established in the social and political arena. The reason being that among the initiators of the movement is A. Volskiy. This figure immediately imparts strength and stature to the movement. And it is not even a question of the power and influence of the Scientific and Industrial Union which he heads. Our industrial managers have been in a restless state of late. They believe in nothing. They do not believe in the CPSU, they do not believe in perestroyka, they do not believe in the democrats. They believe only in a strong personality. The fate of the movement will be decided not by intellectuals, they could join in as large numbers as you like, it would not, all the same, go beyond the framework of office and platform passions. It will all depend on the extent to which it is recognized as its own, to employ the vocabulary of the time of stagnation, by the "economic aktiv."

Enterprise directors treat with great caution such figures as A. Yakovlev, E. Shevardnadze, and G. Popov. These are not for them serious people. But A. Volskiy is an entirely different matter. He is one of them. He is a realist. He is no stranger to the administrative command system, but at the same time he has firmly recognized that this system has no future. Nor will it have. For this reason he is a firm supporter of a transition to the market, but, as he constantly emphasizes, a controlled transition. A. Volskiy does not accept isolationism and once said: "The world economy could somehow manage without us, but we without it, no." And to a correspondent's question concerning the fact that the capitalists would hardly without any benefit to themselves invest billions in our economy, Volskiy replied: "Why without any benefit? Business is business. Capital has to work, multiply, and generate profit. But, to be honest, the main profit for other countries would be stability and harmony within our country." A very sober opinion, in my view. A. Volskiy harbors no illusions concerning the stagnation period, which some figures are today inclined to idolize virtually: "We are reading and hearing increasingly often that our economy has begun to come apart with the transition to market relations. I believe that this is deliberate disinformation. We have not in fact yet switched to the market, and the disintegration began before we announced our market intentions."

There is, therefore, nothing surprising about the fact that the leaders of certain most important enterprises, Ye. Brakov, I. Kemenetskiy, V. Solodkiy, G. Khizha and others, for example, who can in no way be attributed to the democratic wing of our society, almost instantly declared their readiness to support the Movement for Democratic Reforms. The decisive point for them was undoubtedly the signature on the appeal of A. Volskiy.

The development and strengthening of democratic principles in our country are being seriously threatened by the economic crisis. A democracy that is not based on market structures is condemned to perdition. But an economy without democracy also would be in a state of permanent pre-cardiac arrest.

Agriculture

Nationwide Harvesting Status Reviewed

PM0808113191 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 8 Aug 91 p 1

["USSR Ministry of Agriculture and Food Press Center Report"—SELSKAYA ZHIZN headline]

[Text] The grain harvest is under way in all parts of the country. According to figures from the USSR State Committee for Statistics, as of 5 August grain crops (excluding corn) had been reaped on 42.7 million hectares (or 42 percent of the sown area) and threshed on 39.8 million hectares. The pace of work over the past week has maintained the level of the previous week—grain was threshed on 9.7 million hectares.

A total of 84.5 million tonnes of grain have been threshed. Average yields per hectare are 21.2 quintals for the country as a whole, 20.1 quintals for Russia, 28.1 quintals for the Ukraine, 30.2 quintals for Belorussia, and 9.4 quintals for Kazakhstan.

Grain sales to state resources continue to be unsatisfactory, and the pace of grain deliveries has even fallen in comparison with the previous week. In total 19 million tonnes have been sold. Of the grain that has been threshed 23 percent has been sold to the state in Russia, 26 percent in the Ukraine, and 12 percent in Kazakhstan. Grain purchases are proceeding extremely slowly in Georgia, the Uzbek and Tajik SSR's [Soviet Socialist Republics], Kyrgyzstan, Samara and Saratov Oblasts, Tatarstan, and Dagestan.

Feed procurement is continuing. The most organized work in the past week has been done by feed procurement workers in Belorussia, Latvia, and the East Siberia, Central Non-Chernozem, Central, Volga-Vyatka, and Northwest regions of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. In total the country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes have so far procured 6.1 quintals of feed units per head of livestock.

Following the rains in the Urals, West Siberia, and North Kazakhstan growth of perennial and annual grasses has been recorded, which will make it possible to substantially replenish coarse feed stocks.

The position with regard to the material and technical supply of agriculture remains complex. Oil refineries and oil supply centers in the RSFSR are failing to meet their quotas for fuel deliveries to other republics. This is the reason behind the stoppages of harvesting equipment on many farms in Rovno, Cherkassy, Kharkov, Zaporozhye, Lugansk, Kzyl-Orda, Dzhezkazgan, and other oblasts in the Ukraine and Kazakhstan. Supplies of spares for kolkhoz and sovkhoz harvesting equipment are not improving.

'Large-Scale' Grain Reaping Under Way

LD0808200791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] Large-scale reaping of grain has begun. Today, we will tell you about progress of harvest in the country. According to the USSR State Committee for Statistics, cereals and legumes have been harvested on 40 million hectares. Here is Semen Astakhov:

[Astakhov] For three consecutive weeks, during each seven-day period, grain has been threshed on 10 million hectares. Specialists think that the pace is not bad and that the harvesting is progressing better than a year ago. Despite all sorts of obstacles, about 85 million tonnes of grain have already been threshed. But it is being kept in the barnyards. For the time, being the state has purchased less than by the same time last year, despite the impressive measures adopted to stimulate the sale of grain to the state. State and collective farms in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan are especially bad in selling grain. They have sold only six percent of the threshed grain. There is grain in the barnyards of Tatarstan, Samara, Saratov and other Oblasts that are reluctant to sell. Only eight to ten percent of the threshed grain has been brought to the elevators there. The countrywide figure is 22 percent.

Such things have not happened before in our country. One can understand this, of course. The grain is being reserved for cattle fodder. But, feeding unprocessed grain to cattle is not cost effective. Last week, we criticized Kuban, Stavropolye and Rostov farmers. Since then, things have become better in North Caucasus. Kuban has a state order of 3,825,000 tonnes. They have already delivered 2,338,000 tonnes. Corn and rice are still to be delivered. Stavropolye and Rostov, their neighbors, are doing even better.

Winding up the subject of grain, I would like to say that our machine builders have at last pleased the farmers. Within an incredibly short time, a month, a small group of designers in Krasnoyarsk has developed a mini-combine. It is called the Yenisey-900. Its weight is half of that of the Yenisey-1200. It is more economical and less expensive. The Yenisey-900 will be used in the current harvest.

The procurement of fodder, vegetables and other products is continuing in the country. Flax pulling is under way in the Ukraine. Russians are getting ready to do the same. Unfortunately, this year the production of fiber will fall since crops of this wonderful plant have shrunk, and the weather has not been good.

Military

Air Force Training, Conditions Criticized

PM0808124191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Aug 91 p 2

[Interview with Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Vasiliy Vysotskiy by Yu. Geyko—date, place not given; first paragraph is introduction: "Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Vasiliy Vysotskiy: 'We Are Rarely in the Air...'"]

[Text] We were not looking for one another; we met by chance and started chatting: Vasiliy Vysotskiy, 37 years old, a lieutenant colonel in the Air Force, regiment deputy commander for flight training; he saw action in Afghanistan on "SU"—Sukhoy—ground-attack aircraft with 300 combat flights to his credit, and sometimes used to make six-seven flights a day—that is about 2,000 hours in the air.

"Vasiliy Mikhaylovich, if Soviet pilots had been flying the Iraqi airplanes, might the war in the Persian Gulf have ended differently?"

Tall, charming, with the figure of an athlete and the slim fingers of a musician, he does not think long and hard over his answers. You feel that he has all this already thoroughly thought out.

[Vysotskiy] Hardly.

[Geyko] Why?

[Vysotskiy] Because the Iraqi pilots were trained by our pilots.

[Geyko] But surely our pilots are not so poor?

[Vysotskiy] Any thinking pilot today realizes: In the event of a war he is assigned the role of cannon fodder. He also realizes that this bothers very few people "at the top."

[Geyko] But we are talking about our aviation now—the elite of the Army, the cream of society?

[Vysotskiy] It was at one time. Or so they say. There is virtually no competition to get into flying academies. Hence there is only one criterion—health. What sort of testing is there for intellect, resourcefulness, or originality of thought? What kind of elite are we talking about? A Moscow bus driver earns twice as much as a graduate from a flying academy piloting a modern missile-carrying airplane. There are three pilots to one airplane, and each flight is a special occasion, because you only get 50-70 hours flying time a year, and that is four times less than you are supposed to have "according to the book"—what kind of professionalism can one talk of here? Our military airmen are essentially "amateurs."

[Geyko] That is difficult to believe—after all, you hold in your hands terrible weapons, hundreds of millions of people, lives!

[Vysotskiy] That is the point—in an emergency situation the "amateur" is doomed. That is why we have more than 100 accidents and disasters a year. And it is terrible that this number is constantly growing; but the most terrible thing of all is that this process is already out of control.

[Geyko] And are there any other statistics in this area?

[Vysotskiy] There are, and very interesting ones they are too. In the fighter aviation alone, for example, 14 of the 18 "in-flight incidents" in the third quarter of last year involved airmen first class and eight involved airmen second class.

[Geyko] Would you like to comment on that?

[Vysotskiy] First, in order to make the records look good, commanders move everyone up to first class once they have completed one-half of the nighttime training program in ordinary weather rather than in complex conditions. And second—health....

[Geyko] Health?

[Vysotskiy] Why are you so surprised? Our military pilots retire on pension in their prime—at 35-40 years of age, suffering from a host of ailments. Incidentally, a lot of people are touched by this early retirement: Look what heavy demands are put on our airmen, they say. But this is nothing whatever to do with it. Almost all of them smoke—and drink too; only handfuls of them practice sport. Airmen in the United States and in the West fly up to the age of 50.

[Geyko] You said "drink." A lot?

[Vysotskiy] Like the whole of the country—why should airmen drink any less?

[Geyko] My experience agrees with yours—I served in the rocket forces; not in the combat units, it is true, but the research units. Officers' drinking bouts would last for several days and nights at a time; but that was 20 years ago.

[Vysotskiy] I do not think that the consumption of alcoholic drinks has fallen since then in the Army, seeing that it has taken on the proportions of a national disaster in the country as a whole. The reality of the Army that I know is that participation in drunken sprees has become one of the conditions of advancement in the service.

[Geyko] Let us assume you have drunk this evening—when will you sit behind an airplane's control stick?

[Vysotskiy] I do not drink.

[Geyko] Not at all?

[Vysotskiy] No. And I do not smoke either. I play sport every day. Just imagine—it is difficult to live in our system, in which such people are treated with suspicion, like a "white crow." A teetotaler is not appointed to senior posts, since—I quote a top commanding officer—"...he will find it difficult to find a common language and mutual understanding with his subordinates and with commanding officers."

[Geyko] But you have not answered the question....

[Vysotskiy] Read Academician Uglov: Alcohol is retained in the bloodstream for 18 days, lowering every indicator except for that of mental inadequacy. But in aviation, consumption of alcoholic beverages on a Saturday and flights on a Monday have become a routine phenomenon.

[Geyko] What is your attitude to the professionalization of our Army?

[Vysotskiy] We should have begun the process yesterday. Especially in the Air Force, where regular cadres are virtually nonexistent.

[Geyko] They say that it will be expensive.

[Vysotskiy] The losses from the activity of "amateurs", from soldier to marshal, if they were added up and made public, would have a bombshell effect. The issue here is not money.

[Geyko] What is it, then?

[Vysotskiy] Opponents of a professional army fear the appearance of the professional in the Army like the devil fears incense. Because the professional means an end to the comfortable life led by a huge number of bureaucrats in shoulder boards, who do not have the slightest idea of combat training in peacetime or the conduct of combat operations in war, and whose only skill is grabbing everything that titles and official positions give. The class specialist today is a fake. A professional is always a person who has his own opinion and arguments on any issue. He is a proud and upright person with a heightened sense of his own dignity....

[Geyko] Very convincingly put: Such people do not enlist in our Army. You don't order people like that to "do what I say." A professional can only be ordered to "do as I do."

[Vysotskiy] And do you know who will be the fiercest opponents of the professional's appearance in the Air Force? The entire system and above all—the flight safety services.

[Geyko] ?! [as published]

[Vysotskiy] The inexhaustible food trough will disappear: One professional will sit in the airplane's cockpit, another will get it ready for take-off, a third will control the flights, and a fourth will organize them. The professional is in himself the highest guarantee of safety.

[Geyko] You were speaking of the 1,500 circulars which are sent to your regiment from the top every year—do you obey them all?

[Vysotskiy] It is impossible even to read them all. These papers as a rule are indemnities covering the top brass "in case something goes wrong": We issued the warning, the disaster was due to nonfulfillment of our instructions. The professional assumes responsibility himself. The "amateur" delegates it to others.

[Geyko] Do you fear that some unpleasantness might follow the publication of this article?

[Vysotskiy] I am afraid of something else: I know what will happen to my ground-attack aircraft in the first days of a real war.

S-300 SAM System 'Superior to its Predecessors'

PM0908104191

[Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 August 1991 First Edition carries on page 1 an untitled photo feature by Captain Yu. Pirogov, comprising two photographs taken by the author, showing Divisional Chief of Staff Major V. Mochalov and an

S-300 surface-to-air missile system launcher in position. The launcher comprises four long barrels mounted on the rear of a transporter. A 250-word narrative reads as follows:

"These photographs are not quite typical, this being the first time that a moment in the life of soldiers from an Air Defense Troops subunit armed with the latest generation of the S-300 surface-to-air missile system has been 'snapped.' As regards its combat capabilities, it is in many ways superior to its predecessors—it can hit modern aircraft, cruise missiles, and other air attack weapons at any combat altitude. From the operational point of view, the S-300 also incorporates special features—it represents a high degree of automation in the processes of combat work.

"However, the operator's role is as important as ever in realizing the wide range of possibilities that have been built into the system by the designer. For this reason a lot of attention is paid to training high-caliber specialists in the division where Maj. V. Mochalov is chief of staff. The soldiers are constantly studying the components of the surface-to-air missile system which makes extensive use of integrated electronic circuits and digital technology; intensive training is under way. And the result is high-quality combat duty."

Estonia

Military Reform, Defense To Be Discussed 12 Aug

OW0808215591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1850 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Quoting reliable sources in Estonia's Supreme Council, BF's [BALTFAX] correspondent reports that the extraordinary parliamentary session opening in Tallinn on August 12 will discuss a military reform and the establishment of a national defense force in Estonia.

Deputies are expected to adopt a resolution instructing the republic's government to write appropriate laws within the next few months.

At present, most Estonian youths are doing what is called "alternative service" in the police force or in the paramilitary border service set up by the Estonian Government.

Andrus Oovel, head of the Borderguard Department, told BF that he is looking forward to a parliamentary decision to form a national defense force in the republic.

Justice Minister on Union Property Status

OW0808224491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1850 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Estonian Justice Minister Yuriy Raidla has made a few remarks on "union property in Estonia" at a news conference in Tallinn. He said that not a single Estonian enterprise currently claimed to belong to the Center had not been transferred to the Soviet Union for ownership when Estonia was incorporated into the USSR in 1940. All of these enterprises had been subordinated to the central ministries "for purposes of management." Those industrial facilities built in Estonia in the post-war years cannot belong to the USSR either, since Estonia contributed to the union budget relatively more funds than any other republic, due to the higher efficiency of its workforce, Y. Raidla said.

Official, Chinese Consul Discuss Situation

OW0808233891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1850 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In Tallinn, the Estonian Deputy Foreign Minister Rein Mullerson has met with Wan Fuxian [name as received], the recently appointed consul of China in Leningrad. The consul displayed an interest in Estonia's foreign policy and in the present state of the republic's relations with the Soviet Union. R. Mullerson described his vision of the possible development of Estonian-Soviet relation after the signing of the new Union treaty by 9 republics.

The parties acknowledged the similarity of their interests in various spheres, particularly in the economy.

Further on Zhirinovskiy Visit to Republic

OW0808225591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1415 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The leader of the USSR Liberal Democratic Party, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, who has been in Tallinn since August 7, has spoken to workers of the Estrybprom association and the industrial plants Elektrotekhnika and Dvigatel. The excandidate for the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] presidency was invited to Estonia by the republic's Intermovement and Strike Committees Council favoring the Soviet Union's integrity. On Wednesday, he met at the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party (CPSU) with representatives of the Russian-speaking population.

BF's [BALTFAX] correspondent reports that Zhirinovskiy, who is now claiming the post of the USSR President, gave a lot of promises, including that Estonians would be allowed to use their native language only in informal communication, and that Estonia's national flag would be "replaced with a red one or St. Andrew's." He is still pressing for the establishment of a "Baltic gubernia (region)" within Russia, with Viktor Alksnis appointed to act as Governor-General. He urged all those opposed to his policy "to get out of our homeland."

The correspondent says the audience received Zhirinovskiy's speeches rather coolly.

Uniformed Militia Servicemen Patrolling Tallinn

PM0908124391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Aug 91 Union Edition p 2

[Leonid Levitskiy report: "Soldiers in Militia Uniform"]

[Text] Tallinn—Soldiers from the country's MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops are patrolling Tallinn's streets at night.

The appearance of servicemen in militia uniform at the prefecture of police was attributed to extreme necessity—the growing crime in the city. The police do not have enough resources to cope with it.

The regiment currently has around 700 men, 110 of whom are guys from Estonia drawn from the Army. There could have been more of them, but last fall's draft and the current spring draft did not go as well as they might. In accordance with adopted laws, organs of power at all levels refused to "work for a neighboring state's army." The spring draft plant for the republic was 34 percent fulfilled. And since Estonia's young men are opting for alternative service, there are not enough numbers to replenish the Army subunits on the republic's territory or the MVD Internal Troops Regiment. That is why new recruits from Central Asia, Russia, and the Ukraine are going to the republic.

Paper on ID Cards, Subscription Price Hikes

PM0808135391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Aug 91 p 1

["News from Estonia" report by G. Sapozhnikova]

[Text] Tallinn—**Passport Just in Case**

On the initiative of the Estonia Committee and with help from the Central Council of Estonians, the first 100,000 blank identity cards for Estonian citizens have been printed in the glorious city of Toronto. On 1 August enthusiasts from the Estonia Committee in Parnu started receiving applications from people who are legally Estonian citizens and their descendants. The organizers of this measure are in an optimistic frame of mind and consider that by September the whole of Estonia will be issued with identity cards. And in an interview with the Estonian Telegraph Agency, Tunne Kelam, chairman of the Estonia Committee, even implied that people will soon be able to use these identity cards for foreign travel, especially to countries with which Estonia has a non-visa regime. (Admittedly, none of the six completely different workers from the Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, whom I telephoned, could tell me with which countries exactly Estonia has a non-visa regime.) Just in case, the identity cards have been printed in two languages: the state language, Estonian, and the diplomatic language, French.

The Estonian Supreme Soviet Chairman's Press service has reported that the Supreme Soviet Presidium intends to adopt an official decision on this question in mid-August. For the time being he has appealed to experts for advice.

Read It and Pass It On

The Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Publishing House has finally announced the cost of annual subscriptions to newspapers and magazines in 1992. Take a deep breath. SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA will cost 72 rubles [R], MOLODEZH ESTONII will be R60, RAHVA HAAL will be R75, and PAEVELEHT will cost no less than R105....

This, they explain, is due to the latest surge in the price of paper (blank newsprint alone costs 12 kopeks). What is more, postage to deliver a single copy costs eight kopeks plus printing costs. But even that, they say, is not all.

Prices of independent publications will be even steeper. If the price of state newspapers—which nonetheless enjoy the advantages of the party publishing base—has passed the R100 mark, one can only speculate as to how much an annual subscription to other publications will cost....

Latvia

No 'Serious Differences' With Soviet Officials

OW0808215391 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1415 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As BF [BALTFAX] learned from the press service at the Latvian Consulate in Moscow, on August 7 USSR Deputy Interior Minister, General-Colonel Ivan Shilov met with the Latvian Interior Minister Alois Vaznis.

The press service reports the meeting showed that the Soviet and Latvian Interior Ministries had no serious differences over the issues discussed, including the question of the withdrawal of the USSR Interior Ministry's OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] troops from Latvia.

However, Mr. Shilov pointed out that he is not authorized to take decisions on this issue. Nevertheless, he promised to report on the results of their discussions to the USSR Interior Minister Boris Pugo.

On the same day the Latvian Interior Minister met with his Russian counterpart Viktor Barannikov. The meeting revealed complete mutual understanding by the two sides on a whole range of problems.

The two sides agreed to sign in the near future an accord on cooperation between the Russian and Latvian Interior Ministries. A draft accord has already been prepared.

Supreme Soviet Approves Security Branch Heads

LD0908033391 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 2000 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Excerpts] On 8 August at the Parliament of Latvia, the deputies worked in commissions. In the afternoon a session of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia took place. [passage omitted] Participants at the sitting of the Supreme Council's Presidium supported a request for allowing the deputies Girts Kristovskis and Mihails Stepicevs to occupy the posts of heads of the branches of land guards and border guards, respectively, at the Public Security Department. The Supreme Council's Presidium accepted the idea that the program submitted by the republic's government must also be examined by specialists of the Academy of Sciences and of the universities of Latvia.

Law Protection Units Supported by Movement

LD0808125391 Riga Radio Riga International in Latvian 0430 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] The Latvian National Independence Movement has resolved to support the new law protection structures in Latvia. The board of this movement has resolved to support concretely the formation of a separate patrol service battalion by the Interior Ministry of the Republic of Latvia. The movement urges its adherents and members to volunteer for service in the unit, which has demonstrated its loyalty to the Republic of Latvia.

Popular Front Wants Volunteers at Border Posts

OW0808215691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1415 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Deputy Chairman of the Latvian Popular Front (LPF) I. Redisons told reporters that the aim of an appeal for volunteers from the Baltic republics to do duty at customs posts is to guarantee the presence of witnesses in case of new provocations.

The appeal was made by the Latvian Popular Front and the Lithuanian "Sajudis" at a meeting of the Baltic Council of people's movements in Vilnius on August 3. Estonia did not support the appeal.

As BF [BALTFAX] reported earlier, early in the morning on July 31 seven border guards were killed at the Medininkai customs post on the border with Belorussia. One customs officer has been heavily wounded and is in a hospital.

Parliamentary Minority Factions To Cooperate

LD0808124891 Riga Radio Riga International in Latvian 0430 GMT 8 Aug 91

[text] Minority factions in the legislative structures of the three Baltic states have agreed to form a joint consultative structure, along the lines of the Baltic Council. As reported by Sergejs Dimanis, leader of the minority communist Equal Rights faction in the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia, it will mainly concern itself with practical matters, as distinct from the Baltic Council, which Dimanis regards as having already become ridiculous with its endless resolutions. Dimanis did not explain how this political association will work in practice.

Further on Planned Joint Cooperation

LD0808190391 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] The Riga newspaper DIENA has reported that opposition factions in the parliaments of the three Baltic republic that advocate the preservation of the Soviet Union will meet in Riga in two weeks. The main [point] of the meeting is to coordinate the actions of the factions. An attempt will be made to set up a union of the opposition.

Sergeis Dimanis, leader of the Ravnopraviye faction in the Latvian Parliament, told DIENA this organization will be similar to the Baltic Council, with an increased focus on practical activities.

Lithuania

Landsbergis Cited on Relations With Gorbachev

PM0508153291 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 28, 14-21 Jul 91 p 1

[Lyudmila Telen report: "Landsbergis And Gorbachev: Is Dialogue Possible?"]

[Text] Chairman of the Lithuanian Parliament Vytautas Landsbergis usually comes to Moscow for a stopover on his way elsewhere. On July 8 he dropped in at the Soviet capital before going to Strasbourg, where he will speak before the European Parliament. In a pause between Vilnius-Moscow and Moscow-Paris flights Vytautas Landsbergis was invited to answer journalists' questions for Russia's TV. MN analyst Lyudmila Telen also asked several questions.

[Telen] What would you say if, say, tomorrow President Gorbachev invited you to Novo-Ogarevo?

[Landsbergis] I would ask him to specify the time.

[Telen] What would be your conditions?

[Landsbergis] Relating to Gorbachev? None.

[Telen] If there is no such invitation, are you ready to show the initiative?

[Landsbergis] I've done that already.

[Telen] What was Gorbachev's answer?

[Landsbergis] Silence so far. [Landsbergis ends]

Negotiations between the Soviet Union and Lithuania at a lower level are known to have reached deadlock. For a year and a half now the central government and the Republic fail to find a common language and confrontation continues. Perhaps it's worth looking at other possibilities.

Chairman Landsbergis is prepared to join the Novo-Ogarevo agreements. In which capacity—could be cleared up in the course of the talks. All that is needed is for the talks to get started.

Invitation to Economic Meeting Not Received Yet

OW0908120091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1100 GMT 9 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The President of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Lithuania, Mr. Vytautas Landsbergis, has not yet received an invitation to attend the meeting of the 15 republics planned for the end of August, without the participation of the centre, reports "BALTFAX" from the Lithuanian Mission in Moscow.

Kazakh President, Nursultan Nazarbayev, recently suggested the idea of such a conference. It is proposed to discuss matters of economic cooperation.

Center's Declaration on Medininkai Decried

OW0908113991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1100 GMT 9 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Lithuanian Government Commission investigating the circumstances of the murder of seven police and customs officers at Medininkai on 31st July has published a declaration which states that the Commission has no reason to trust the declaration of 7th August by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the KGB and the Soviet Army. The declaration speaks of the non-involvement of the above organisations in the Medininkai tragedy.

The Lithuanian Government Commission substantiates its opinion that since January 1991 Lithuania has experienced continual acts of violence in which representatives of the KGB, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Soviet Army have participated (the events in Vilnius in January in which 14 people were killed, the seizure by the military of Lithuanian Government installations, continual attacks on customs posts, one of which resulted in the death of seven police and customs officers at Medininkai... "BALTFAX"). However, the Soviet law-enforcement bodies have not found persons guilty of any of these incidents.

The Commission's report also states that in the last few days several additional divisons of Soviet paratroopers have been transferred to Lithuania.

Shield Says KGB, OMON Behind Medininkai Deaths

OW0808165691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1600 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The chairman of the military association "Shield" ("Shchit"), Mr. Vitaliy Urazhtsev, said at a press-conference in Moscow on Thursday that a group of experts from the "Shield", who analysed the circumstances of the murder in Medininkai came to the conclusion that this killing had been masterminded by the KGB and that the OMON [special purpose militia detachment] units from Riga and Vilnius played a "supportive role".

However, the "Shield" experts have not produced any direct material evidence or witnesses' reports to prove their case. According to Mr. Urazhtsev, this terrorist attack was intended to produce negative ramifications abroad on the eve of the Soviet-American summit.

"The Shield", he said, is in favour of withdrawing the OMON subordinated to the Soviet Interior Ministry and the Soviet Army units from Lithuania, and of setting up Lithuanian rapid reaction forces to combat political terrorism. He also urged to conduct an international investigation of the crime committed in Medininkai.

Colonel Sergey Kudyashov, a member of the "Shield", said at the same press-conference that anonymous KGB officials who spoke with him described an active role the KGB is playing in the investigation as "an attempt to side-track, to derail or to gain control over the investigation".

More on Shield Inquiry, Allegations

LD0908012491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 2130 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] Meanwhile it has been reported at today's news conference in Moscow by the members of the independent officers' union Shchit [Shield] that they have met with the two KGB officials who wish to remain anonymous. The KGB officials warned that the participation of the KGB in the investigations into the Medininkai massacre is merely an attempt of the Soviet secret services to control the investigation process and misdirect it as much as possible. The KGB officers also advise that the only remaining alive witness of the brutal gundown, who has also been shot through the head, should be protected from any possible provocations.

Security measures have been taken from the very first day when he was brought to the hospital unconscious. Up 'til now there was no official denial of the conclusions arrived at by the Shchit experts group that themassacre was masterminded and headed by the Soviet KGB.

KGB Statement Denies Shield Claims

LD0808143191 Moscow TASS in English 1413 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS—Accusations of the USSR State Security Committee of involvement in the tragic events on July 31 at Medininkai in Lithuania "are totally ungrounded, do not correspond to reality and are provocative", the public relations centre of the USSR KGB said in a statement released here today.

The statement was made "in connection with publication by several news media of the results of 'independent investigation' by the 'Shield' organisation". (Set up in October 1989, it has the aim of providing social protection to servicemen and their dependants—TASS).

The USSR KGB "resolutely condemns the criminal action" and "takes the most active measures to search for the criminals", the document says.

It points out that "any biased evaluations and rash conclusions on this matter are impermissible because they can seriously hamper the investigation and search for real perpetrators of the crime".

Investigation Into Medininkai Tragedy Continues

OW0908115891 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1109 GMT 9 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Lithuanian Prosecutor General is continuing his investigations into the murder of seven police and customs officers on 31st July at the Lithuanian customs post of Medininkai on the border with Belorussia. As "BALTFAX" reported earlier at the Lithuanian Government press-centre, the Prosecutor's office has found eye-witnesses who, if necessary, could identify the murderers.

Paratroops Said Brought 'Secretly' Into Republic

LD0908113891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 9 Aug 91

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] There exists no basis for trust. This is how yesterday's statement [by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the KGB] was assessed by Lithuania's governmental Commission For Investigation of the Medininkai Crime.

The commission's statement points both to earlier and also to totally new attempts by the leadership of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs, the KGB, and the Ministry of Defense to conceal the truth and to purposefully mislead the public.

In addition to this, the commission claims that in the past few days several planeloads of additional paratroop units have been secretly brought to Lithuania. [passage omitted]

Planned Protest Against Vilnius OMON Assailed

LD0808175191 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 8 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius August 8 TASS—Deputy commander of the Vilnius unit of OMON elite militia, Major Leonid Fedchenko told TASS there is no doubt that a planned protest against OMON is aimed at whipping up tension in order to prolong as much as possible the stay in office of the present Lithuanian Parliament and Government.

He said the OMON militia personnel will do its utmost to avoid fresh accidents during the protest action. This depends, hovewer, not only on OMON, but also on the organisers of the picketing of the OMON base.

The entire responsibility for possible provocations and other undesirable consequences will rest on Sajudis and those whose interests it represents, Fedchenko said.

A rally in support of OMON organised by Lithuania's civic committee was held at the entrance to the OMON base at five p.m. today. Some 500 people took part in the rally. Speakers expressed gratitude to and support for OMON and condemned the policy of the Lithuanian authorities.

Republic Police Search for Medininkai Witnesses

OW0808163991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1600 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Officials from the Lithuanian criminal police and the procurator's office have spent two days in Riga searching for possible witnesses of the tragedy which occurred at the border crossing in Medininkai (on the border with Belorussia) on July 31 when 7 customs officials and policemen were killed.

The chief of the criminal police, Mr. Andris Staris, told BF [BALTFAX] that residents of the Lithuanian republic might have passed the Medininkai border crossing on the night from July 30 to 31 and could notice the vehicles the killers had used. The inquiry already has information relating to those vehicles.

The criminal police forces of Latvia and Lithuania have appealed to Latvian citizens who were on the highway Riga-Vilnius-Minsk to volunteer any information relating to the Medininkai murder. It has already been reported that the Lithuanian Government offered 500 thousand roubles to anybody who helps to uncover the crime guaranteeing anonymity.

Vilnius Party Secretaries Protest TV Reports

PM0808134191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Second Edition p 2

[Undated appeal by the Council of Vilnius City Party Committee Secretaries under the "Cables to PRAVDA" rubric: "Appeal to B. Yeltsin, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic"]

[Text] The nighttime edition of Russian Television's "Vesti" Program carried a report citing V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, saying that "'Russian nationalists' have claimed responsibility for the tragedy in Medininkai." This Russian Television report helps to further kindle anti-Russian sentiments in Lithuania and may have tragic consequences. Russian organizations advocating terrorism are still unknown in Lithuania. In a rule-of-law state only a court can determine the people guilty of causing such tragedies.

We urge you to use your authority to stop Russian Television's being used to kindle anti-Russian sentiments in Lithuania.

[Signed] The Council of Vilnius City Party Committee Secretaries. (The appeal is signed by more than 20 secretaries).

Decision Adopted To Set Up 'Weapons Fund'

LD0808221191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Summary] The Government of the Republic of Lithuania has adopted decision No. 322 of 8 August on setting up the Lithuanian weapons fund. This fund will collect firearms or ammunition donated or given in some other way by residents of Lithuania; money donated by the public to purchase such items for the defense of the state; and all weapons confiscated by order of law. The Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] and the Department for the Defense of the Land together with the General Procuracy of the Republic of Lithuania have been entrusted with the task of organizing the reception of weapons, and testing, recording, and handing them over to the fund in compliance with the regulations of the weapons fund.

Persons who deliver weapons to the city or rayon police commissariats or the stations of the Department for the Defense of the Land will be given receipts if they request it.

The firearms of the Lithuanian weapons fund will be distributed by a decision of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania after being tested by the MVD system.

More on 'Stock of Weapons' Decision

LD0908101191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0815 GMT 9 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Utsila]

[Text] Vilnius, 9 Aug (Tass)—The Lithuanian Government has adopted a decision on setting up a "stock of weapons."

As reported today by the republic's press, the need to set up the stock is justified by the activity of "the Special Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON] of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and other repressive structures", the need to "strengthen the protection of the borders and customs posts" and a desire to "stop possible armed actions by inhabitants of the Lithuanian Republic".

The Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Department of Border Protection of Lithuania are called on to organize the acceptance, checking, registration, and transferral of weapons into the "stock".

The General Procuracy has also called on the population to hand over to the stock "all firearms, ammunition, and explosives being kept by the population without the appropriate authorization". All those who voluntarily hand over weapons are promised immunity from criminal and administrative responsibility for keeping them unlawfully.

This decision is seen by local observers as the first step in effecting the idea, widely publicized recently in Lithuania, of "the right to defense, including armed defense".

Return of Illegal Weapons Urged

LD0908110591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 9 Aug 91

[Text] In a statement, the General Procuracy of Lithuania urged the turn over of all firearms, ammunition, and explosives that members of the population possess without an appropriate permit to the arms fund.

Individuals who comply will be exempted from criminal and administrative responsibility for illegal arms possession.

Republic Premier Defends Financial Situation

OW0808215091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1415 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius sent a message to a number of public organizations which sharply criticized the government for price rises in the republic.

In the opinion of Mr. Vagnorius, the Lithuanian Government "has been pursuing an active policy and saved a billion rubles for the republic."

"If the government had passively followed the consequences of the economic crisis in the USSR, every Lithuanian citizen would have lost 200-300 rubles a month", Mr. Vagnorius pointed out.

He says that the Soviet Union may issue this year as much as 200-250 billion rubles—almost half of the forced savings accumulated since the creation of the USSR.

Mr. Vagnorius says these forced savings "put pressure on Lithuania as well, destroying a burgeoning market system and devastating shops". The Prime Minister suggests Lithuania's share in the forced savings may reach 4 billion rubles or half of the republic's national income.

Deputy Economic Minister on Privatization Plans

LD0708120491 Moscow TASS in English 1139 GMT 7 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius August 7 TASS—"About 1.5 million of residents of Lithuania, nearly half of the republic's population, have already received papers entitling them to a lump sum paid by the state to privatize its property and compensate people for their deposits and insurance," Lithuania's Deputy Minister of Economics Antanas Mercaitis told TASS.

"About two-thirds of all state property will be privatized in the republic," he stressed. "Much work lies ahead. September, according to Mercaitis, will be a period of accumulating experience, after which the privatisation process will gain momentum at the beginning of the last quarter of the year".

The deputy minister noted that preparations have been completed: nearly 7.7 billion roubles have been deposited on citizens' investment accounts to enable them purchase state property. The first shops, cafes and everyday service centres were out for sale already in August. But for a number of reasons the deals will be sealed only in early September, Mercaitis said.

He added that the government had worked out a package of regulatory enactments on the basis of the law on the privatisation of apartments passed by the Parliament. The registration of applications to purchase housing began this week.

Asked what privileges are envisaged to enable people working at enterprises slated to be privatized to buy them out or acquire shares, Mercaitis noted that equal opportunities should be granted not only to those who are employed in the distribution and services networks, industrial enterprises and building organizations which are slated for privatisation first of all. No special privileges or preferences are therefore envisaged.

Along with this, according to Mercaitis, a measure has been envisaged to bar speculators for snatching property and considerable amounts of shares—cash quota has been established for purchasing state property. Each resident of Lithuania will be entitled to a lump sum of up to 5,000 payable by the state. Later, Mercaitis said, the sums will be doubled under the law on indexation of the cost of the main means of production.

Former OMON Member Sentenced for Explosion

LD0808175991 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 8 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Ukmerge, Lithuania August 8 TASS—A former serviceman of the Vilnius unit of OMON elite militia of the USSR Interior Ministry was sentenced to two years of deprivation of freedom with obligatory work at a construction site.

On the night of May 2 1991, Andrey Voronetskiy and another member of OMON police, Aleksandr Shevelev, set off an explosive device at a bus stop on the outskirts of Ukmerge and were detained by militia on the spot. Next day they were dismissed from OMON, and the main culprit had to face the court.

Continuing Reportage on Communist Party Plenum

Prokofyev Address Noted

PM0808140591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 First Edition p 3

[Version of speech delivered by Yu.A. Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow party city committee, at 6 August Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee plenum from plenum materials prepared for the press by L. Leonov, A. Ryabov, and I. Filimonov under general heading: "From Speeches at Plenum"]

[Text] Comrades, the split in the CPSU into different trends is obvious. And the split of our society is just as obvious. Let us take the results of the election of the Russian president. The least number of votes were cast for Bakatin. That is, for an amorphous, eroded pseudocentrism. Russia is turning away from politicians who are seeking to suit everyone. Our moral duty today is to define ourselves.

The gamble on criticism instead of the precise definition of the path, of our own model for the reform of society, did not justify itself, which has enabled our political opponents to use the weak aspects of this position in their own interests and has enabled them to face society with a false alternative whereby there are only two paths—either back to the past or else in the direction of a new capitalist revolution demolishing to its foundations everything built in the 73 years of Soviet power.

But there is a third path, in which I believe, the path of evolutionary changes, of radical reforms which do not break with the socialist idea or the traditions, national uniqueness, or cultural foundations of our great Motherland. We must define ourselves in such a way that society and our opponents recognize in us not opponents of any reforms but supporters of different principles for reforming society. Then there is room for political struggle, but otherwise there is the trap in which we have found ourselves. Is that not the card Rutskoy is playing now? It is that card.

We shall look the truth in the eye. The country is on the verge of an abyss, there is a most profound crisis of the system. Over half the population (both right-wing and left-wing) already recognizes violence as a normal method of political struggle. We cannot speak today of a united CPSU since in various regions of the country the situations are often directly opposed. Either we shall go toward the Baltic republics and East Europe or toward China and Kazakhstan. But not backward, and I think that the majority of all those present understand that.

Unfortunately, I must note that already there is no single CPSU, a federation of communist parties of the union republics is being formed, and it cannot be any other way since they are all working under absolutely different conditions and much will depend on us, on the Russian Communist Party, as regards what it will be like. The future of the CPSU depends on this. This is not the first attempt to destroy the CPSU. This was first done via the Democratic Platform, they tried to destroy our party from below, that was last year. The attempt to destroy the party from below did not succeed. This year massive attempts are being made to destroy the party from above. That is through the "Movement for Democratic Reforms," through the creation of the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia.

I am not inclined to dramatize. The attempts by Rutskoy and Shevardnadze will hardly have any great success. A new party requires new ideas. In neither case are there new ideas. A new party requires new leaders, and they too are missing. We are simply observing the leaping about of the same figures. Such cynicism will not be accepted today by society, and society is already showing that.

And finally a new party requires support from below, and that too is missing. Hopes that these new parties will be swelled with members of the Communist Party, with you and me, have not been justified. I do not know how it is in other regions but in Moscow something like 250,000 people have left the party in this time. And only a few have joined other political movements. The others have not joined any political movements or parties.

Will we be able to give the Russian Federation Communist Party a goal and guidelines enabling it to acquire broad support in society? That could be achieved if the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party becomes the party of the third way, that is if it breaks with those who are calling us to the past and those who are calling for nomenklatura capitalism under cover of phraseology about the market and democracy. I also believe that the RSFSR Communist Party should remain loyal to the patriotic idea.

In this connection I am convinced that we need radically new approaches toward questions of theory.

If we want to influence public awareness, it is impermissible for us to have only one central newspaper, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. We need mass media designed for different categories of the public. In our Moscow organization we are trying to do this. Since May the newspaper MOSKVICHKA, designed for women, has been published. In August the daily newspaper VECHERNIY KLUB will start publication. The first issue of the newspaper BUMBARASH, for young people, has been published. We need vigorous activity by Russian Communists in television and radio. We need to coordinate the activity of regional publications. We also need our own system for the distribution of the party press.

The party of Russian Communists needs its own modern concepts on all basic issues perturbing society. That is why the Moscow party city committee is seeking to consolidate intellectual forces around itself and is publishing items which so displease Lipitskiy and those who stand behind him and whom he represents, since these items reveal the essence of the transformations to which they are pushing society and reveal from scientific positions and show their antipopular nature.

We must also consolidate our positions among the working class. Without that the party will not be viable. The holding of a congress of workers in our city has shown that the majority of the working class still believes in the CPSU. And it is probably expedient to hold a congress of workers and peasants on the scale of our republic.

Antonovich Assails Rutskoy

LD0708212491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 7 Aug 91

[Excerpt] Yevgeniy Zherebyonkov [correspondent] sums up the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] CP plenum and quotes [Russian Communist Party, RCP, First Secretary] Kuptsov and [RCP Central Committee Secretary] Antonovich from today's news conference on the results of the plenum.

[Begin recording] [Kuptsov] yesterday's plenum by an absolute majority of votes supported the decision of the Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee which deemed it irregular to establish a second CPSU party. This is a general point of view. The results of voting on this question—including the organizational question regarding exclusion of the Central Committee members, exclusion from the party—it was also taken by the absolute majority of the Central Committee members. Questions connected with the work of the party organizations under conditions of departyization were examined. This question, although to be expected, came as a surprise to us. It has brought enough confusion into the work of the party organizations by destroying the existing, the usual regime of work. Therefore, the plenum has expressed its attitude to this question.

[Zherebyonkov] How is the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party going to deal with those Communists who decide to join Rutskoy's party? And, if further exclusions follow, how many of its members will the RCP miss? Will such measures prevent the split in the party? RCP Central Committee Secretary Ivan Antonovich is very resolute about this:

[Antonovich] I think that by its actions and its decision the RCP Central Committee created a precedent yesterday. Those Communists who join the other party should have to leave this party. As for the numerical dynamics, shall we start by saying that the new party's book-keeping is not yet quite accurate? Today in the press the number of 7,000 already registered in the new party has appeared. I phoned their organizational committee and asked what these figures are based on. We should know, after all, we have to use proceedings against these people which are required by the rules, so to speak. This figure was not confirmed to us either by documents or statements. They referred to the verbal preliminary announcements, saying that everything will be revealed later. Therefore, to make forecasts—as Rutskoy did—that about 5 million communists will join him, is the over-optimism of a party leader who is only a beginner. As for me—we will see.

[Zherebyonkov] The leaders of the RCP evidently have not lost optimism. Even Boris Yeltsin's harsh decree on departyization did not make them lose hopes to return the stray president into the true party course. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Expulsion of Rutskoy, Lipetskiy Condemned

OW0808182791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Political Council for the Movement for Democratic Reform (MDR) has resolutely condemned the decision of the Central Committee of the Russian Federation's Communist Party to expel Aleksandr Rutskoy and Vladimir Lipetskiy from the Communist Party. The MDR believes that this action is targeted against democracy.

Indulging in the rhetoric on cooperation, accord, consolidation and ideology, the leaders of the party act the old Stalinist way, according to the worst traditions of the past. The MDR qualified that step as an act of political revenge. "This is one more proof of the inability and unwillingness of the party's leaders to renounce the practice of persecuting dissidents and act with due account taken of the new socio-political situation. [quotation mark as received]

The MDR draws the attention of the public to the fact that "in this case the victim is the vice president of the Russian Federation, elected by the nation, and the initiator of our reformatory movement."

Communist Party Issues Resolutions at Plenum

On Political Situation

PM0808110991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 First Edition p 1

["Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee Plenum Resolution" dated 6 August 1991]

[Text] **On the Political Situation in the Republic and the Communist Party's Tasks (Theses of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee)**

1. The theses of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee "on the political situation in the republic and the Communist Party's tasks" should be taken as a basis. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat should be instructed to elaborate the Theses with

a consideration for the discussion which took place at the plenum and the specific proposals from localities. They must be sent to the party committees and published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and the local party press.

2. On the basis of the Theses the RSFSR Communist Party republican committees, kraykoms [kray committees], and obkoms [oblast committees] must determine specific measures to ensure the unity of actions of the party organizations and Communists. They must actively promote the pooling of efforts of the entire public for the sake of preserving the integrity of the USSR and the RSFSR and consolidating the soviets as organs of the people's power. They must promote the implementation of the measures taken by the organs of legislative and executive power to overcome the political, economic, and spiritual crisis, to stabilize the work of enterprises and other economic structures, and to improve the situation on the consumer market. They must consistently defend the interests of the working people and citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms. They must explain to working people in a reasoned way the positions of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee on topical problems of the economy and social life and the aims and tasks of the Communists' activity under present conditions.

3. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, Secretariat, and commissions and the party republican committees and kraykoms and obkoms must focus attention on the work of primary party organizations under the altered conditions and help them elaborate forms and methods of political influence on the solution of urgent social and economic problems of the population's life, on the implementation of land reform, and on the consolidation of the power of the people's and of legality. They must render all-around support to the workers movement, the activity of the "Peasants Union," and patriotic associations.

4. After the publication of the draft CPSU Program there must be a discussion in the Communist Party and the broad discussion of this draft must be organized in the republic's party organizations and in the labor collectives and mass media with a consideration for other versions of the draft CPSU Program elaborated in the party organizations.

Party committees of all levels must generalize their remarks and proposals on the draft CPSU Program and on the CPSU Statutes presently in operation and send them to higher-ranking party committees.

On Democratic Comunists Party

PM0808121591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 First Edition p 1

[Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee Plenum 6 August 1991 resolution "On Constituent Conference of Democratic Party of Communists of Russia"]

[Text] The so-called constituent conference of the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia (DPCR) held in Moscow 2-3 August 1991 in contravention of the existing CPSU Statutes announced the creation of a party within the CPSU. The party statutes were approved. Leading organs were elected. It was decided to hold in October 1991 the first congress of the DPCR at which it is planned to adopt the party's program documents and elect delegates to the extraordinary 29th CPSU congress.

The importance of this conference goes far beyond the framework of the Communists' statutory right to express opinions, of the comparison of different views and platforms, and open criticism and self-criticism. The conference is aimed at splitting the CPSU.

The participants in the constituent conference were not elected in accordance with the CPSU Statutes, did not represent the majority of the republic's party organizations, and consequently had no right to make decisions affecting the internal structure of the CPSU and the republican party organization.

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat has declared the decisions of the conference to be invalid. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee Plenum supports this position and states that the decisions of the conference have no force and are not liable to execution.

The plenum believes that RSFSR Communist Party Central committee members A.V. Rutskoy and V.S. Lipetskiy, having headed the organizational committee to create the DPCR and having delivered reports at the conference, have openly embarked on a factionary path and are conducting activity aimed at splitting the CPSU and incompatible with the title of CPSU member.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Plenum decrees:

1. That for their actions which contradict the CPSU Statutes and are aimed at splitting the party A.V. Rutskoy and V.S. Lipitskiy be removed from the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and expelled from the CPSU. The relevant primary party organizations should be informed of the decision which has been made.

2. The republican, kray, okrug, city, and rayon party committees and primary party organizations must do everything necessary to prevent and intercept splittist actions in the RSFSR Communist Party and the CPSU as a whole. They cannot allow those seeking to create a parallel republican party organization (party within a party) and thus split the CPSU to have the opportunity to do so by remaining in its ranks.

3. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Plenum urges the Russian Communists to strengthen party comradeship, not to succumb to the subterfuges of the splitters of the party ranks, and not to give the leaders

of the newfound party the opportunity to drag them into an unseemly political game. Our strength lies in discipline and organization. Only in that case together with the workers, peasants, and laboring intelligentsia will we be able to defend our socialist choice.

4. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Committee must be asked to examine the question of the nature of the participation of its chairman, CPSU member Comrade N.S. Stolyarov, in the work of the DPCR constituent conference.

On Departyization Decree

PM0808131791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 First Edition p 1

[Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee 6 August 1991 resolution "On Urgent Questions of the Work of the RSFSR Communist Party Party Organizations in Connection with the RSFSR President's 20 July 1991 decree 'On Suspending the Activity of the Organizational Structures of Political Parties and Mass Public Movements in the State Organs, Institutions, and Organizations of the RSFSR'"]

[Text] 1. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee believes that the RSFSR president's decree contradicts the USSR and RSFSR Constitutions, the USSR Law "On Public Associations," the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights, and also the RSFSR Law "On Enterprises and Entrepreneurial Activity" of 25 December 1990 signed by B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, Article 32 of which proclaims: "The enterprise labor collective, irrespective of its organizational-legal form... determines and regulates the forms and conditions of the activity at enterprises by political parties and religious and other public organizations."

2. The plenum suggests to all organizational structures of the RSFSR Communist Party that they proceed from the premise that the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has adopted for examination the question of the constitutionality of the RSFSR president's 20 July 1991 decree. Until the conclusion of the Constitutional Oversight Committee and the decision of the top fully empowered organs of the USSR on this question, they must continue their activity in strict compliance with the USSR and RSFSR Constitutions and on the basis of the CPSU Statutes and also in accordance with the RSFSR Law "On Enterprises and Entrepreneurial Activity" of 25 December 1990.

3. In connection with the fact that the idea of departyization has not been approved at the congresses of RSFSR people's deputies, the RSFSR people's deputies should be asked to suggest to the Russian president that he suspend the operation of the decree until a decision has been made on this question by the next Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and until a conclusion has been received from the RSFSR Constitutional Court on this decree's compliance with the RSFSR Constitution.

4. The leaders of enterprises and institutions must be asked for this period not to take measures to suspend the activity of the organizational structures of political parties and mass public movements. If administrative pressure is brought to bear and repressive measures are taken, the RSFSR Communist Party organizations in conjunction with representatives of other parties and public movements should protest to and ask for protection from the supreme organs of state power of the USSR and RSFSR and the court and prosecutor's office.

5. The RSFSR Communist Party central Committee urges all party organizations and all Communists to maintain restraint and calm, to continue vigorous activity in the interests of the working people, and to use forms and methods of work in the labor collectives in compliance with the situation which has taken shape and together with other public associations to prevent the disruption of the process of the country's democratization.

New Communist Party Leader Kuptsov Interviewed

PM0808105591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with V.A. Kuptsov, first secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, by PRAVDA correspondent A. Shinkin; date and place not specified; first four paragraphs are introduction: "V.A. Kuptsov: There Must Be No Confrontation. PRAVDA Correspondent Holds Brief Interview With V.A. Kuptsov, First Secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] One cannot say that there was a special atmosphere at yesterday's press conference given by leaders of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party at the CPSU Central Committee Press Center. Nevertheless, the room was virtually full and journalists' questions once again underlined the mass media's interest in the processes currently taking place in the Russian Communist Party.

Opening the press conference V.A. Kuptsov, the new first secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, pointed out that the Central Committee plenum, despite certain predictions, was constructive, businesslike, and interesting. As for the extraordinary RSFSR Communist Party Congress, the next plenum will decide the date of this congress and its agenda, and will consider all working issues.

In response to questions about the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee's stance, Communist Party leaders noted that the myth about the Politburo's conservatism and its resistance to democratic processes and new market relations does not accord with reality. It was underlined once again that the Russian Communist Party leadership advocates democracy, but democracy based not on violence and chaos but on law and order; it advocates the market and mixed forms of ownership, but a constructive market, not a speculative, criminal market.

As for the creation of the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia [DPCR], the leadership of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee assessed it as an attempt to split the party. There is no breach of the rules in Rutskoy's expulsion from the CPSU, just as there was no desire to bypass the primary organization where he is on the party register. Rutskoy disregarded Communists' frequent invitations to come along and explain himself. In the opinion of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee leaders, the creation of the DPCR will not cause a tremendous exodus of Communists from the party. However, they urged those people who want to do so to ponder their decision long and hard. The draft CPSU Program is being printed today and there is time before the congress to consider everything carefully.

[Shinkin] Valentin Aleksandrovich, now that you are head of the Russian Communist Party, what do you think about its position in a society of raging political passions?

[Kuptsov] As I see it, the party finds itself in the fundamentally new situation that has developed since the Russian presidential elections. First, a president has been elected. Our candidates got nowhere. We have to recognize the reality of the situation. That's for starters.

Second. We have to clearly define our position. And tell ourselves and people that we are not, by and large, the ruling party. We don't have that kind of majority either in the Russian Supreme Soviet or in the government. Therefore we should change our forms and methods of work. We must find means of cooperating with the authorities. We must support things that are being done today in people's interests. And state openly on what issues we hold different positions.

It is not only the Russian party but also the CPSU as a whole that needs ways of renewing itself. A suitable reaction is required today to the changes taking place in society so as not to lag behind. So that we can predict, forecast, and decide ways of democratizing the party. Departyization is a reality in life today although we hope that the Russian president will somewhat amend his decree and we hope that the Constitutional Oversight Committee's findings will be fair. Nevertheless the party cannot be dead in these conditions; it must operate in electoral districts.

[Shinkin] Don't you see departyization as a tragedy?

[Kuptsov] No, I don't. Over the last 70 years, if I can say this, all collectives have formed a social skeleton, comprising the party, trade union, Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League], and other public organizations. It is via these organizations that the second part of their work takes place—something that cannot be expressed by way of the plan, profits, or finance. I think that destroying everything at a stroke means creating difficulties for labor collectives, particularly when destatization and privatization are beginning.

[Shinkin] What ways do you see of cooperating with the Russian president?

[Kuptsov] I think that the president is also interested in the Communist Party cooperating with him since that will help consolidate society and implement the reforms and decrees that he adopts. Boris Nikolayevich is an outstanding politician, he realizes that the Communist Party must not be discarded as a political force that has clout in society and fairly sizeable levels for affecting the real situation.

[Shinkin] Will you wait and see who takes the first step?

[Kuptsov] Why? That kind of childish behavior is not my scene. When Boris Nikolayevich gets back from his tour of the country, I will telephone him and say that I want to meet with him and the government.

[Shinkin] Do you have an action program for your post as first secretary?

[Kuptsov] Like everyone, I have my own views. I have not worked out any particular program. I think that we'll do this on a collective basis.

[Shinkin] Do you hope to avoid the labels that were pinned on your predecessor and that still dog the RSFSR Communist Party leadership today?

[Kuptsov] No, I'll hardly manage to avoid them. Our adversaries will make special efforts to pin labels, despite the fact that we intend to espouse a position of cooperation and interaction. As the CPSU's leading detachment, we will always spearhead the political struggle and, given the present standard of political culture, we will evidently not avoid labels. That is why we must simply refute the lies implied by these labels by our actions.

Yeltsin Concludes Tyumen Oblast Trip 8 Aug

Talks in Siberia Summarized

LD0808124191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1045 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Excerpts] Tyumen, 8 Aug (TASS)—Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] President Boris Yeltsin, is today completing his trip around West Siberia. [passage omitted]

Meetings with oil workers and gas workers, construction workers, geologists, and representatives of minority northern ethnic groups demonstrated yet again throughout the itinerary of the trip the complexity and abnormality of the problems that have accumulated here. In conversations with them Boris Yeltsin reported in particular that in the near future the upper limit of wages will be removed, there will be wage increases; that up to 30 percent of the raw materials that are extracted will remain for oil workers and gas workers and they will be able to dispose of them as they wish.

On the subject of problems of national autonomous okrugs in the territory of the oblast, the RSFSR president spoke out in favor of oblast territorial integrity and promised that problems of the indigenous population will most certainly be reflected in future plans for the development of the region.

To judge from the statements by the RSFSR president during meetings with the people of Siberia, the oil and gas sector will move to Russia's jurisdiction.

This evening, after a conference in Tyumen on the results of his trip, Russia's president will fly back to Moscow.

No Documents Signed

LD0808172191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1607 GMT 8 Aug 91

[By correspondent Mikhail Prutkin]

[Text] Tyumen, 8 Aug (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin, the Russian president, today completed his trip around Siberia. However, there was no success in signing documents on the new status of Tyumen Oblast. "The problems which have accumulated in the west Siberian oil and gas complex turned out to be too serious," Boris Yeltsin said to participants in a final conference. "Additional work needs to be done on the draft, otherwise the decisions adopted will again remain just on paper."

The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic president read out instructions to work out a decree and decision of the Council of Ministers of Russia by 20 August, in accordance with which it is proposed to leave oil and gas workers ten percent of extracted raw materials this year to increase this figure next year to 30 percent. Enterprises will be freed from paying 40 percent on hard currency earnings and will start dealing with republics that have not signed the Union treaty exclusively according to world prices.

It is planned to cardinally expand the rights of the oblast itself and to give, in particular, the right to issue licences and to introduce payment for use of nature [platnoye prirodopolzovaniye].

The people of Siberia have been promised that the upper limit on wages and bonuses will be removed and that the problems of the indigenous population and cooperation between autonomous regions and the oblast will most certainly be reflected in documents which are being prepared.

Boris Yeltsin called on the people of Siberia not to hope for centralized capital investment, but to rectify the situation by using those resources which will remain in the hands of the labor collectives themselves.

Promises Decree

OW0808163691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Ending his tour of the Tyumen region, President of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin, met with the deputies of the regional Soviet in Tyumen, on Thursday. From August 5 to 8 Mr. Yeltsin visited Nadym, Salekhard, Noyabrsk, Khanty-Mansiysk and Nefteyugansk.

We intend to adopt a decree on the Tyumen region and a resolution of the Council of Ministers specifying ways of solving the main problems, Mr. Yeltsin said. "However, during my visit, I got confronted with more than 300 problems and we decided to finalize the draft decree and publish it by August 20," he said. He also said that over this time property run by the Union must be placed under the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation and subsequently passed to the local governments.

Mr. Yeltsin noted that a new variant of the document—"Commission to the President"—had been adopted. This document says that by August 20 a decree on the Western Siberian economic region should be adopted. It also says that the district and regional soviets must be given the right to give industrial enterprises export licences for selling part of the manufactured products on their own.

In the fourth quarter of the year, they will probably be allowed to sell 10 per cent of their output and, beginning January 1, 1992—30 per cent. In the future, the percentage may be increased still further. As to oil and gas, 15 per cent of the remaining oil and gas will be placed at the disposal of the local soviets (10 per cent will be handled by the soviets and 5 per cent—by the industrial enterprises.)

Besides that, the industrial enterprises of the Tyumen region will be freed from paying 40 per cent of the so-called presidential tax, Boris Yeltsin said and expressed hope that the Soviet President would not be hurt by this forced measure because the latter would increase the Tyumen oil- and gas-industry workers' interest in enhancing their labour productivity.

Mr. Yeltsin noted that during his visit to the Tyumen region one more serious problem was revealed—cooperation with foreign companies. According to the KGB, which has analysed the Tyumen firms' and enterprises' dealings with foreigners, these contacts had a negative result.

"Inexperienced Tyumen businessmen are deceived by fictitious firms," said Boris Yeltsin.

On Parliament Relations With E. Europe

OW0808151[illegible]91 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1415 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Thursday morning Boris Yeltsin visited Nefteyugansk where he had a meeting with oil workers. In the course of the talk two problems were touched upon: the work of the Russian Supreme Legislative Bodies and the problem of relations with the Eastern European countries, Viacheslav Terekhov, the special "Interfax" correspondent reports.

The Rusian President described the work of the republican supreme council as "fruitful". At the same time he doubted the necessity of the existence of such a body as the Congress of Deputies of the RSFSR.

Touching upon the problem of relations with Eastern European countries B. Yeltsin spoke out in favour of concluding direct agreements with them. "We are very closely connected with them economically," he said, "and so the sharp falling-off in our relations will badly reflect on us too."

The Russian President also said that "such agreements should be concluded by the Union in principle. But the Union's leadership does not do that fearing that the former socialist countries could enter NATO."

According to Boris Yeltsin such apprehensions are in vain, since it is unprofitable to the NATO members that these countries enter NATO." [quotation mark as received]

Yeltsin Receives Appeals on Union Treaty

Democratic Russia

LD0808223791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2030 GMT 08 Aug 91

[Text] We have just received an appeal to Yeltsin, Russian Federation president, issued by the Coordination Council of the Democratic Russia movement. The appeal says that democratically minded people have contradictory feelings about Russia's planned signing of the Union treaty on 20 August.

The appeal also puts forward a number of demands. They are as follows: the Union treaty should be signed simultaneously by at least four republics: Russia, Kazakhstan, the Ukraine and Belorussia, or the abovementioned republics should at least state that they have firm intentions to do so. The final variant of the Union treaty should be discussed by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet and the Russian people should be told about it. It should exclude statutes or proposals which contradict the declaration on Russian Federation state sovereignty. It should accept that the Union constitution can be adopted by the undemocratically elected congress of people's deputies or by the USSR Supreme Soviet, its branch.

Well, I think that Boris Nikolayevich will examine this and give a feedback in our bulletins very soon.

'Well-Known' Figures

LD0808165791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1202 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] NEZIVISIMAYA GAZETA publishes an appeal to Boris Yeltsin which was signed by a number of well-known figures in the democratic movement, in particular, one of Democratic Russia's leaders Yuriy Afanasyev and academician Sakharov's widow Yelena Bonner. The appeal contains a call not to sign the Union treaty, the text of which up to this point in time has not become known to the public. The authors of the appeal propose that the main clauses of the union treaty should be put to an all-Russian referendum and they call on Yeltsin not to force through the signing of the treaty without careful and thorough discussion by the public.

Further Reportage on Departyization Decree

Initial Impact Reported

PM0808101991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Aug 91 p 1

[A. Kosulnikov report: "Ordered to Survive"]

[Text] The Russian president's departyization decree came into force Sunday. Yesterday news agencies carried the first reports.

"Those For"

RIA reports that the order has already been signed to withdraw the party committee from the Vladivostok Fisheries Port.

Vasiliy Yefremov, chief of the Tyumen Oblast State Security Administration, stated that the KGB Administration Party Committee will carry out the decree. He noted that many of its operatives would most likely terminate their membership of the CPSU, URAL-AKTSEPT reports.

The Leningrad branch of the "Democratic Russia" movement has also stated that it is winding up its structures in state institutions and at enterprises.

As of yesterday the CPSU organization is also being wound up at the Russian Council of Ministers, where around 500 people are registered....

"Those Against"

The Constitutional Oversight Committee in the independent Republic of Tatarstan has stated that Yeltsin's decree does not accord with individual provisions of the Tatarstan Constitution, and that whether or not the republic carries it out is an internal matter for the republic as a sovereign state.

Clearly, the decree is not a decree for the Kemerovo RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Obkom [Oblast Party Committee] either. It called on the oblast's Communists to "maintain their restraint and calm." And to strive for the repeal of the decree in a restrained and calm fashion, POST-FACTUM reports.

TASS has reported that 53 plant party organizational secretaries at Leningrad's plants also disagreed with the Russian president's decision. And only 10 percent of the directors of Leningrad enterprises and institutions (as of the morning of 5 August) had signed orders to withdraw party committees from their plants and institutes.

"Those Abstaining"

Boris Gidaspov, first secretary of Leningrad Party Obkom, stated that, although the decree contravenes the Constitution, Communists who advocate a rule-of-law state should obey it. B. Gidaspov added that the decree will provide an incentive for party organizations' work at people's places of residence....

Here are the results of a poll carried out by staffers at the Political Sociology Laboratory of the USSR Academy of Sciences Urals Department's Institute of Philosophy and Law. Some 77 percent of Sverdlovsk residents who were polled categorically and unequivocally approve the Russian president's decision, 52 percent of Communists intent to obey the decree, and almost a quarter of CPSU members are planning to fight to preserve their party organization. None of those polled agreed with the proposition that the departyization decree violates human rights.

No Reprisals Yet

Pavel Voshchanov, the RSFSR president's press secretary, stated on behalf of B. Yeltsin that the period within which the decree has to be carried out has not been set, and no administrative measures will be taken on this score before the year's end.

Incidentally

The latest issue of the CPSU Central Committee weekly GLASNOST attempted to refute the comment in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA which said that a meeting of party workers from Chelyabinsk's Tsentralnyy Rayon had supported the departyization decree. It turns out that this party meeting had merely decided to wait for the decree to be carried out. Will the Constitutional Oversight Committee nonetheless deem it illegal?

Sergey Smirnov, our own correspondent in Chelyabinsk, met with T. Svechnikov, first secretary of Tsentralnyy CPSU Rayon Committee, and explained that the departyization decision had nonetheless been adopted at the meeting. But it had been decided to turn to the party obkom and the CPSU Central Committee for an explanation of the procedure for carrying out the decree.

In Svechnikov's opinion, this sharp reaction to the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA comment was prompted by the fact that Chelyabinsk's Tsentralnyy Rayon Committee had reacted "too quickly" to the Russian leadership's decision. Without the gravitas which is a feature of real Communists, as it were.

The text of the resolution passed by the 31 July CPSU Tsentralnyy Rayon organization aktiv meeting is being edited.

Tatar Bodies Not Implementing Decree

LD0908032891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2230 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] The first session of the Tatar Presidential Council considered the issue of the operation in the republic of the decree of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president. Taking into account that the decree is directly or indirectly in breach of the declaration of the Tatar Soviet Socialist Republic's state sovereignty and a number of articles in the republic's constitution, as well as with the aim of creating necessary conditions for labor collectives to make independent decisions on the issue of their attitude toward party structures and other public movements, it was decided that Tatar's state bodies will not be required to implement the RSFSR's president's decree.

Udmurt Sees Implementation of Decree

LD0908032191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2230 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] Reports are still coming in about implementation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president's decree on departyization. The party organizations have ceased operating at the Procuracy and the Udmurt KGB. The republican Ministry of Justice is getting ready to take the same action. Our correspondent notes that the KGB staff has sent the remaining party membership fees, amounting to 2,500 rubles, to the account of the Uva orphanage.

A telegram has been sent to the RSFSR's KGB. It requests that the republican law on the KGB should provide for an article banning the staff of that department from being members of any party. While the law enforcement bodies in Udmurt have already begun to implement the RSFSR president's decree, republican enterprises are not in a rush to follow suit. The deadline for implementation has not yet been set, as everyone knows.

Yeltsin, Silayev on Possible Oil Price Hikes

OW0808195891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1920 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian president returned to Moscow on Thursday after his trip round the Tyumen region where his pronouncements about a possible oil price hike in the Soviet Union had far-reaching repercussions.

Before his departure from Tyumen, IF [INTERFAX] correspondent Vyatcheslav Terekhov asked Mr. Yeltsin: "Doesn't the Russian leadership fear that even talk on that subject might send prices skywards?"

"We do have fears, that is why I do not stop pointing to the need for a thorough analysis of such a step. We are not going to specify the proposal for an oil price increase in the decree on the Tyumen region, nor do we attempt to set a new price. We will not take this step until the government, together with other republics, studies this problem carefully. We will look through the whole list of goods which will be affected if oil prices are increased. However, we cannot afford to keep oil prices at the present level. It has a substantial adverse effect on the development of the republic's economy and, in particular, on the profitability of the oil industry", Mr. Yeltsin said.

The Russian prime minister, Mr. Ivan Silayev, added that among the republics which intend to sign the Union treaty Russia is an importer. "We import consumer goods, foodstuffs etc which rose in price 2-3 times, while oil prices remained unchanged. This factor should be taken into account, too. Prices of oil and other goods should be balanced".

"Otherwise Russia ends up becoming a raw materials appendage to the other republics", Boris Yeltsin concluded.

Democratic Communists of Russia Resolution Cited

PM0808085191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 7 Aug 91 p 1

["Resolution of Constituent Conference of Democratic Party of Communists of Russia"]

[Text] Concerned for the fate of Russia and aware of their responsibility for the plight of the country's peoples, which has been the result of the state and administrative-edict rule of the CPSU, resolutely breaking with the totalitarian heritage and rejecting ideological dogmatism, aware of the unacceptability and unsoundness of the conservative policy pursued by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party leadership, voicing the will of the majority of Russian Communists regarding the need for fundamental democratic transformations in society and the party, the conference decrees:

1. That a Democratic Party of Communists of Russia [DPCR] be created within the CPSU as a voluntary sociopolitical association operating within the framework of the laws of the USSR and the RSFSR by parliamentary methods and taking part in the implementation of democratic reforms aimed at consolidating the welfare, social protection, and rights and freedoms of Russian citizens and at establishing a social market economic, civil society, and rule-of-law state. That the delegates of the constituent conference who have voted for the party's creation be deemed to be members of the DPCR.

2. That the interests of the peoples of Russia be defended, supporting the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and president and the Russian Government in their activity for the radical renewal of society.

3. That DPCR Statutes be adopted. That the DPCR Council be instructed to register it at the RSFSR Ministry of Justice within the procedure laid down by law and to inform local party organizations within a month of the number of the party's current account and also of the mechanism for recording DPCR members and the procedure for admission to its ranks, including the admission of former CPSU members who have left it in connection with their disagreement with the political course of the RSFSR Communist Party.

4. That an organizational period be announced as of the moment of the DPCR's registration. The DPCR Council and all conference delegates must immediately begin preparation for the creation of primary and local party organizations and discuss in them the draft program guidelines and statutes of the DPCR. In September-October this year the election of delegates to the first DPCR congress must be held following the norms of representation laid down by the DPCR Council and the election of cochairmen of the party on an alternative basis by direct secret ballot by all DPCR must be prepared.

5. That the first DPCR Congress be held in Moscow October through November 1991. That the following questions be submitted to the congress:

a). The program guidelines of the DPCR, the party Statutes, and topical tasks of its activity.

b). The election of the central organs of the DPCR and the leaders of the party's central mass media.

c). The CPSU Program.

d). The election of delegates to the 29th CPSU Congress.

6. Considering the need to consolidate party and public organizations and citizens of Russia adhering to the idea of creating a society of civil, national consensus, that it be deemed expedient for the DPCR to join the all-Russian "Civil Consensus" sociopolitical movement as a collective member. That the DPCR Council be instructed to take the relevant action.

7. Considering itself an inalienable part of the country's democratic forces, that it support the initiative to create a Movement for Democratic Reforms and recommend that DPCR members take part in the establishment and activity of this Movement.

8. That the RSFSR president's decree on the suspension of the activity of the organizational structures of political parties and mass public movements in state organs, institutions, and organizations of the RSFSR be deemed timely and constitutional. The structures of the DPCR should initially be formed as territorial, professional, and functional associations, party clubs, and so forth.

9. In sharing the concern voiced by a number of conference participants regarding the safekeeping of CPSU archives, the conference demands that the CPSU Central Committee immediately create a commission with the participation of representatives of the republican CPSU party organizations to monitor the safekeeping of archives and ensure their accessibility.

Adopted 3 August 1991, Moscow.

Tatar Party Leader on Republic Party Program

PM0808154191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Aug 91 First Edition p 2

[N. Sorokin report: "Decision Deferred"]

[Text] Kazan—"We are pleased that our party organization's draft program being subjected to nationwide discussion in Tatarstan coincides almost entirely with the party's draft program examined at the CPSU Central Committee July (1991) Plenum," R. Idiatullin, first secretary of the Tatar Republic CPSU Committee, told a TASS correspondent. "Our program is to include two phases, covering the next two or three years and the long-term future. It provides a concrete answer on how to escape from the crisis.

A system is to be created with a mixed economy and various forms of ownership. One of primary party organizations' tasks is to supervise the privatization process.

It is party members' duty to avert unemployment, particuarly among young people.

Touching on the decree issued by RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] President B. Yeltsin on departyization, the republic committee secretary stressed that this decree is not valid on the territory of sovereign Tatarstan.

At the recent 42d republic party conference a debate flared up over the status of the Tatar Communists' organization. Some of the conference participants demanded that the creation of a Tatar Communist Party be announced since a declaration of republic sovereignty had been adopted. Others pressed for it to be incorporated within the RSFSR Communist Party. It was agreed that the "Tatar republic committee's place within the CPSU structure will be decided after the Union treaty has been signed."

TV Reports on Moscow Radioactive Dump

LD0808210191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] [Video shows an overgrown tract of land, followed by a still of a map which says at the top "Section 198, Moscow ring motor road, 26 km, waste land". The map shows the details of the area] (

[Reporter Veronika Kutsilova]) This is not just a vacant plot. This is a dump we have inherited from the 1950's. But the legacy is impressive. In some places here the radiation level exceeds 1,000 micro-roentgen an hour. I will remind you that the background radiation level in Moscow is 13-14 micro-roentgen. The experts believe that the higher radiation level at the dump has been caused by the waste discharged as part of the work on creating a nuclear bomb. (Video shows another map showing plot 198 in detail. At the top of the map it says "The diagram of sections contaminated with radioactivity"] Similar contaminated areas in the residential areas of Krasnogvardeyskiy rayon have been decontaminated. Moscow oblast refused to accept radioactive waste from Moscow and the dump is now only partially contaminated. There is probably just one way to achieve full decontamination.

[Z.V. Dengin, senior geologist of the Moscow expedition of the Geological Association "Tsentrologiya"—identified by caption] This whole layer of the waste penetrated by radioactive minerals should be buried right here on the spot, insulated, covered and sealed with clay.

[Reporter] So, it is quite possible that Moscow will receive its own clay-made sarcophagus. The experts claim that the dump does not present any direct threat to the population since the radiation level is at its highest only near the ground. About half a meter above the ground, however, radiation runs at 20-25 micro-roentgen an hour. This is normal. This is, of course, reassuring but what about our feet?

Republic Supreme Court Party Cell Disbands

PM0808095391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Aug 91 Union Edition p 2

[V. Rudnev report: "Russian Supreme Court Depoliticized"]

[Text] The last party meeting was held in the Russian Supreme Court 5 August, the first day of operation of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president's decree "On Ceasing the Activity of Organizational Structures of Political Parties and Mass Public Movements in RSFSR State Organs, Establishments, and Organizations."

Twenty people applied to leave the CPSU. A decision to cease the activity of the primary party organization was adopted by a majority of votes (with two votes against and two abstentions), and Communists were recommended to transfer either to the territorial party organization under the rayon CPSU committee or at their place of residence. It was decided to transfer the remaining party funds totaling 2,000 rubles to assist pensioners. In short, one question was decided promptly.

Another question provoked a stormy debate—over the depoliticization of the Supreme Court or, more accurately, the suspension of CPSU membership while fulfilling judges' duties. Some argued that this is a personal matter for every judge. Others tried to convince people that membership of any political organization runs counter to the principles of the court's independence. Yet others proposed waiting and removing this question from the agenda, since the RSFSR president's decree does not require this and the existing CPSU Statutes make no provision for such a point. The scales seemed to be tipped by a mention of the members of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, who long ago suspended their CPSU membership despite the absence of direct instructions to do so. It was decided by a majority of votes that members of the Russian Supreme Court should suspend CPSU membership while acting in this capacity.

Democrats Readying Protest of Compulsory Service

OW0808223491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1920 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Moscow organisation of the Democratic Party of Russia (DPR) and its youth wing are ready to launch a protest action against the "recruitment of students" provided for by the draft law on compulsory military service which was prepared by the defense ministry, Ms. Vera Zheleznova, a member of the Moscow organisation executive said at a press-conference in Moscow on Thursday.

A similar intention was stated earlier by the leadership of the Russian republican party.

Ms. Zheleznova said the address by the DPR to the Supreme Soviet and public opinion of the USSR stresses it is unreasonable to draft students now that the armed forces are subject to cuts. She said the DPR is in favour of creating a professional army in the USSR.

On August 1 a student strike committee was set up in Moscow to work out a program of action against the draft, Mr. Igor Ptichnikov, the committee's co-ordinator said.

He told IF [INTERFAX] the strike committee was planning to set up pickets from September 1 to 7 outside hotels in which Soviet MPs stayed. From September 7 to 15 they intend to hold rallies and on September 15, the day when the Soviet parliament is resuming its deliberations, the strike committee is going to organise a mass protest action in Moscow to demand that the draft law be dropped from the session's agenda.

Belorussia

Communists Issue Statement on Yeltsin Decree

LD0908020191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2030 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] A statement by the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party was published in procommunist newspapers in Belorussia on Wednesday. Strangely enough, it was devoted to the decree on departization by the Russian President, which has come into force. (Maksim Taborov), our correspondent in Minsk, reports:

[Begin Taborov recording] The decree by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] President, the statement says, was perceived with anxiety by the Communist Party of Belorussia. A forcible departization of enterprises and organization is, essentially, under discussion. This is inadmissible in a law-abiding state, which we are creating.

The Central Committee states: The decree by the RSFSR president contradicts the USSR Constitution, the law on public associations, the international pact on civil and political rights, and other norms of international law.

At a time when the USSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision has not yet made a decision with regard to the decree, Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee has already decided everything. Does it agree with the principles of a law-abiding state? It seems, this is not a question, over which the leaders of the Belorussian communist party will rack their brains. On behalf of the communists of Belorussia the leaders expresses solidarity with the party colleagues in Russia, calling upon them to be firm and consistent and to continue active work for protecting legal rights and the interests of working people. This does not need comment.

To all appearances, they intend to defend the interests of these faceless working people for a long time. The Belorussian communist party recently demonstrated its inability to give up its principles when it gave shelter to Nina Andreyeva and her associates. There is an appeal to USSR and RSFSR people's deputies, Supreme Soviets and the President of the country at the end of the statement to stop the implementation of this illegal, and anti-democratic decree, as they call it. This is our last and determined battle.

Official Appeals for Chernobyl Aid

LD0808172391 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 1725 GMT 7 Aug 91

[Text] A. Malofeyev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia, has sent a message to M. Gorbachev, USSR President and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, in which he expresses his concern over the fact that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution on additional measures for granting help to the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in liquidating the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station [AES] incident has not been adopted yet.

The message says: These questions—allocating hard currency for purchasing medical equipment and medicine, additional financing of state capital investments in connection with the increasing costs of construction of objects, assigning doctors to the republic to provide the population with a general special clinic system, financing the law on social protection of the citizens who have been affected by the Chernobyl AES catastrophe, and a whole number of other questions—make the moral and psychological situation more complicated every day. Such a passive attitude to pressing needs of the population on the part of some officials of the center undermines the trust in the abilities of soviet, party, and economic bodies to provide not in words but in deeds a comprehensive help to the people who have became hostages to the Chernobyl tragedy. The address concludes: I am asking for your cooperation in solving all these questions.

Ukraine

Electoral Commission Session Discussed

LD0808213591 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 1900 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] The first sitting of the central electoral commission for electing the president of the Ukraine, which took place today, examined the main directions of its activity. Boyko, chairman of the commission, chaired the sitting. The plan of the main organizational measures on preparing and holding elections of the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] president and also the work plan of the central electoral commission were examined at the sitting of the commission. Electoral districts for elections of the president were created and the form of election documents for preparing and holding the elections and providing finances, materials and machinery for the election campaign was elaborated. Propositions were made on the order of organization and the issuing of certificates to political parties, public associations and movements on their right to present a candidate for the Ukraine SSR presidency.

It was stressed at the sitting that the campaign for preparing and holding elections of the Ukraine SSR presidency should be held in an open way and on broad and democratic principles. A number of other issues linked to preparing and holding elections of the Ukrainian president were examined.

Moldova

Republic Population Issues Assessed

LD0808084691 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2005 GMT 7 Aug 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] On Friday, the late edition of TSN carried a report alleging that Moldova's military department was going to set up special paramilitary formations to suppress by force the separatist movements in Pridnestrovye and the southern part of the republic. The press-secretary of Moldova's military department contacted Vesti and officially denied this TSN report. Nevertheless, there are quite acute problems relating to the non-Moldovan population in the republic. Our special correspondent looks at them.

[S. Pokryshkin] At first glance, everything is quiet in Moldova. But not for long, it appears.

[Unidentified man in the street] But what can we do? Either we should run, or maybe things will change.

[Pokryshkin] Many people among those called nonindigenous feel the same way. As many as 48,000 families are already prepared to run to the Ukraine and Russia. The rate of Jewish emigration is 2.5 times higher than average in the country. This is the result of calls at rallies, such as throw Jews into the Dnestr!, push Russians beyond the Dnestr!, of purges in organizations according to nationality, and many other things done by the authorities and their supporters last year. This year dismissals continue. Serious obstacles have sprung up for those wishing to have higher education in Russian. A good law on citizenship has been adopted. However, it has a clause which compels many people to give up USSR citizenship in order to become Moldova's subject. And this means today, in fact, the same as the old slogan: A suitcase—a railway station—Russia. The situation regarding freedom of speech remains strange. Practically all the media cover the situation in Moldova, on the whole, from the same point of view. Another thing is strange. The following lines can be found even in respectable newspapers. [video shows lines: "The Russian-speakers have been taught to be spongers on indigenous peoples"] These lines are taken from the intellectual pedagogical weekly Fakel. [video shows line: "The Jews are competing in profaning Orthodox faith"]. And this is a quote from a large historical article in the parliamentary newspaper SFATUL TSARII.

And all this is taking place after seemingly moderate politicians have removed from power the impatient radicals who represented the People's Front. In the view of Yuriy Roshka, leader of the front, only the tactics but not the strategy has been changed, though. Those who believe that the current policy does not suit a country which has always been multinational agree with him on that. First of all, judging by our conversations, quite a few Moldovans are among those who disagree. And, undoubtedly, the Gagauz and the Pridnestrovye people are the most organized opponents of this policy. The republican leadership obviously cannot find a common language with them. The situation can even deteriorate, primarily over the law on local self-administration. It allows the authorities to place their own people everywhere but not everywhere do people agree with that. In the region of the imaginary border with Pridnestrovye there will be many places where people will refuse to comply with the law. Also, six large villages wish to join the Pridnestrovye Republic while the republic itself, together with the Gagauz Republic, is striving to obtain the right to sign the union treaty. If the authorities decide to defend their policy by force, clashes and real conflicts will follow. According to well-informed sources, such a development of events cannot be completely ruled out today. [video of streets, marches, rallies]

[Kisilev in the studio] This was a view of Sergey Pokryshkin, our special correspondent of one of the facets of the current situation in Moldova. I will note that over the last two weeks we have more than once invited Moldovan television to give us a reportage presenting different views of the same subject but have received no reply. Nevertheless, our proposal remains valid.

People's Front Said To Lose Supporters

PM0608152791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, IAN, RIA, AP, REUTER, UPI roundup: "Moldova People's Front in Sociological Mirror"]

[Text] The Moldova People's Front is rapidly losing its supporters. A sociological poll carried out in the republic revealed that 62 percent of respondents condemn its activity. They are particularly suspicious of the front's policy in favor of Moldovan unification with Romania and its refusal to participate in the elaboration of the Union treaty.

While favoring a sovereign Moldova on condition that close economic, political, and cultural links with the rest of the republics are preserved on a federal basis, 70 percent of those polled expressed the hope that Moldova will become a sovereign state and join the renewed Union. A mere 26 percent of respondents believe that Moldova should become a fully independent state. IAN reports that the Moldova People's Front proposal to rename Moldova the "Romanian Republic of Moldova" was supported by just 9 percent of respondents.

Government To Stimulate Grain Sales

LD0608090791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0800 GMT 6 Aug 91

[Text] Torrential rain continues to increase the amount of damage inflicted on the Moldovan agro-industrial complex: according to specialists' forecasts the grain harvest will scarcely exceed 1,2 million tonnes, which is a great deal less than expected.

In order to ensure uninterrupted supplies to the public of grain products and of combined fodder for livestock rearing, the government of the Republic of Moldova has authorized collective and state farms and other agricultural enterprises to sell up to 30 percent of their grain at contract prices, and procurement organizations to buy this in the amounts provided for by the state order. The government resolution sets maximum contract procurement prices for grain. Procurement organizations have been given permission to use bank credit for grain purchases, with the interest being met in part from republic budget funds.

It is intended to organize the sale of manufactured goods and consumer goods to labor collectives on farms in return for an increase in the sale of grain above state procurement levels.

For the duration of the state order period, the transport of agricultural produce beyond the republic's borders and trading in it are prohibited with the exception of supplies to Union consumers and in accordance with agreements between republics.

Georgia

Mass Rally Held by Georgians, Armenians, Russians

Rally Held in Sukhumi

AU0808114991 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Russian 1430 GMT 7 Aug 91

[Text] Yesterday, a mass rally was held by the Georgian population at the republican stadium in Sukhumi. Representatives of towns and rayons of the Abkhazian Autonomous Republic and representatives of the Russian and Armenian peoples residing in Abkhazia took part in the rally. Among those who addressed the meeting were deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia [names indistinct] who analyzed the situation that had taken shape in Abkhazia before the elections to the Supreme Council of the autonomous republic. The speakers subjected the Abkhazian leadership to severe criticism. In particular, in the opinion of the speakers, Vladislav Ardzinba violated the previously concluded agreement on the composition of the central electoral commission of Abkhazia. Those who spoke at the meeting favored a change in the composition of the commission or its total dissolution and the creation of a new one. Olga [surname indistinct], a pedagogue, pointed out that representatives of the Russian population in Abkhazia do not experience any oppression on the part of either Georgians or the Abkhaz. Eduard Bukaryan, a resident of [name indistinct] rayon, delivered a speech. He said that the Armenian society "Krunk" had no right to speak on behalf of the entire Armenian population of Abkhazia, because the majority of the Armenians support Georgian independence.

The rally was addressed by Temuraz Koridze, chairman of the permanent commission dealing with questions of science, education, and culture at the Georgian Supreme Council; Dilar Khabuliani, minister of internal affairs of the Republic of Georgia; and Manana Dzodzuashvili, minister of public health. They also subjected to criticism the policy of Ardzinba and those who share his views and expressed a hope that common sense will ultimately prevail and mutual understanding and respect will be restored between the Abkhaz and the Georgians. The participants in the meeting adopted a resolution and an appeal to the population of Abkhazia.

Rally Urges Soviet Army Patrols

OW0708023191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 6 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Last Monday's authorized rally organized by such public organizations as "Soyuz", "Vozrozhdeniye" and "Krunk", favoring Abkhazia's signing of a Union treaty,in Sukhumi, demanded that the Abkhaz Supreme Council dismiss the republic's public prosecutor, justice minister and acting interior minister. According to some estimates, between 2,000 and 8,000 participants in the rally urged Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to impose joint patrolling with the Soviet Army units stationed in Abkhazia.

A telegram sent on behalf of the rally's participants to Mikhail Gorbachev says violence and lawlessness have swept over the republic. "Law enforcement bodies are split according to nationality. Mass corruption is thriving there. From time to time their employees even come to agreements with criminals. So, they not only are incapable of protecting citizens, but also they represent a threat to law and order".

The participants in the rally believe the situation is aggravated by political confrontation between Abkhazia and Georgia which "nips in the bud any constructive measures taken by the Abkhaz leadership to improve it".

The rally also considered it necessary to bring into Abkhazia USSR Interior Ministry troops guided from Moscow.

IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent reports that Chairman of the Abkhaz Supreme Council Vladislav Ardzinba who spoke before the rally has agreed to meet the demands and promised to take urgent measures to normalize the situation.

New Minister of Culture Appointed

AU0808114391 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 26 Jul 91 p 1

[Text] Decree of the President of the Republic of Georgia on the Appointment of E.L. Kalandadze as Minister of Culture of the Republic of Georgia:

To appoint Edmond Lavrosiyevich Kalandadze as Minister of Culture of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] Zviad Gamsakhurdia, president of the Republic of Georgia.

Tbilisi. 22 July 1991.

Legal Expert on Charges Against Ossetian

PM0608155291 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 29, 21-28 Jul 91 p 7

[By Professor Aleksandr Yakovlev: "A Bizarre Case of Law"—first paragraph is MOSCOW NEWS introduction]

[Text] At Zviad Gamsakhurdia's recent press conference in Moscow MN asked the Georgian president about the fate of Torez Kulumbekov, who was arrested in January in Tshkinvali. By way of response MN was issued a copy of the indictment against Kulumbekov compiled by V.M. Shengelia, chief investigator of the Procurator's Office of the Georgian republic. MN asked legal expert Aleksandr Yakovlev to comment on the document. The following are his comments:

"T.G. Kulumbekov has been accused of a number of serious crimes, including 'inciting national strife'. Here's the evidence: 'as a historian' the defendant 'distorted historical facts' and 'falsely represented relations between Georgians and Ossetians' in his public speeches. He himself is characterized as 'an extremist' who was 'involved in anti-Georgian activity', 'organized the declaration of a Soviet Democratic Republic of South Ossetia', wrote and published a 'declaration of state sovereignty', prepared a document entitled 'Interim Law on Elections' and had it passed by the regional government, as well as organizing the elections in question. 'Adoption of the declaration of sovereignty,' says the indictment, 'the striving to sign the Union treaty as an independent subject of the federation, ignoring in all the documents the lawful rights and interests of the Georgian Republic, and the rejection of Georgia's jurisdiction cannot be regarded other than as an encroachment on Georgia's territorial integrity.'

"Let the readers themselves decide: Can interpretation of historic facts, declaration of sovereignty and organization of elections be considered criminal activity? If so, how many more people could be charged with the same crime?

"We can criticize and reject other people's views, that is quite normal. But incitement of ethnic hatred is a different matter. This could be a grave crime. What draws the line between unwelcome words and a crime? If nationalist propaganda leads to a real threat of violence, that is a crime. But I fail to see how Kulumbekov's words could lead to violence.

"The indictment includes one important episode. Georgian medical personnel came to Tshkinvali in order to help those wounded in the fight. They were captured by 'unidentified extremists' and brutalized. According to the text of the indictment, the medics were 'verbally and physically abused'; the room where they were kept was entered by Kulumbekov who 'exchanged satisfied glances with the extremists' and 'cynically' asked the medics: 'Why did you come to Ossetia?' Then the Georgian Minister of Public Health demanded that the medics be released.

"What was criminal about Kulumbekov's behaviour in this episode? Did he participate in physical violence? No. The victims said he didn't lay a finger on anyone. However, Kulumbekov was accused of an attempt to maliciously and savagely murder several people. The proof was this: Two men were put in a separate room. Torturers 'bound an iron chain round the leg of one of the victims and suspended him by the chain, beating him continuously'. Then, according to one of the victims, 'Kulumbekov ordered us to be burned to death by a blow torch'. At that moment the Minister of Public Health appeared and released everyone. The release was not preceded by a fight, but only a quiet discussion.

"Here's what Kulumbekov says: On learning about the apprehension of the medical men, he went to where the captives were being kept (in order to be exchanged for Ossetians captured by Georgians). He introduced himself to the men, offered them cigarettes and then (as the victims themselves acknowledge) led them and the minister out of the house and sent them home. No one was suspended by the leg in his presence. Neither did he order that the captives be burned to death.

"Law is based on the presumption of innocence of a person until his or her crime is proven. When no material proof is available to corroborate it, a victim's testimony must be treated cautiously.

"Law ends where it begins to serve political ends. And what's more, a nation cannot be free if law is sacrificed in order to gain freedom. Now, when the basis for a new Georgian statehood is being built, it is particularly important to create precedents of respect for law and proof of guilt, and to ensure true independence of the bodies of justice."

Abkhaz Leaders Meet With Public Figures

AU0808115691 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Russian 1430 GMT 7 Aug 91

[Text] On Tuesday, 6 August, in Sukhumi, in the Supreme Council of the Abkhazian Autonomous Republic, a meeting was held between authoritative figures of the Georgian population and Vladislav Ardzinba, chairman of the Supreme Council of Abkhazia. Topical issues concerning the political and economic development of the autonomous republic, in particular, questions on holding elections to the Supreme Council of the autonomous republic, were discussed. The meeting proceeded in a constructive and open atmosphere. Among those who participated in the meeting were Vakhtang Kolbaya, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Council of the Abkhazian Autonomous Republic; Vladimir Mikamba, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of Abkhazia; and other high level officials. It was decided to hold such meetings and consultations in the near future in order to fully stabilize the situation and to hold elections to the Abkhazian Supreme Council in a normal atmosphere.

Armenia

Republic To Complete Weapons Registration

LD0808180891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1145 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] Yerevan, 8 Aug (TASS)—Registration of weapons and of persons who have "expressed a willingness, if the need arises, to take part in defending the Armenian population and insuring its security" is to be completed in Armenia in the course of a week. A decision to this effect has been taken by the republican operational headquarters, a coordinating body set up by the presidium of the republican Supreme Soviet and the presidium of the republican government.

Unregistered weapons are liable for confiscation in a two-week period beginning on 1 September, says an instruction issued by the headquarters today. The document also makes provision for the prosecution of persons keeping unregistered weapons.

A statement by the defense committee attached to the Armenian Council of Ministers promulgated on 27 July appealed to "Armenian youths prepared to defend their native land and their people and in possession of the necessary combat weapons" to report to the defense headquarters attached to the rayon soviets "in order to register and receive their instructions".

Citizens who by virtue of their state of health and family circumstances "are prevented from taking part in military operations" but who possess combat weapons were asked to hand them in and take a receipt for them. This document was interpreted by many as a mobilization decision. According to Armenian people's deputy Vagan Shirkhanyan, chairman of the republican defense committee, however, the purpose of the statement was to "get a clearer view of the available forces" and to clarify the quantity of weapons held by members of the public.

Journalists Briefed on NKAO Situation

LD0808202491 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Aug 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The results of the trip by a delegation of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputies to Armenia and Azerbaijan were discussed at a news conference today. More than 30 journalists from various publishing bodies were present there. The press representatives were briefed on the mechanism worked out during the trip for the localization of armed conflicts in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast—it has been presented to the leaderships of the two republics. The mechanism presupposes in its first stage the withdrawal of troops and cease-fire on both sides; after this, everyone evicted from Shaumyanovskiy rayon should be returned there. Special attention was given to the actions taken by the armed forces, which have been described as criminal. The deputies noted in their speeches that the Soviet Army behaves as if it were not subordinate to the center, willingly offering its favors to the Azeri side, something which is becoming extremely dangerous.

At the end of the press conference, deputy (Belozistoy) stated that the main driving force in the conflict is the communist parties of the union and Azerbaijan. [video shows news conference in progress]

'Tension Prevails' in NKAO; Two Armenians Dead

LD0808210291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1400 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Text] Tension prevails in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO). According to a report of the Directorate of Internal Affairs of the NKAO, bodies of two Armenian peasants showing signs of violent death were found in a fieldcamp of the village of Damirli of Mardakertskiy rayon yesterday.

On 5 August, following payment of a ransom of R50,000, two Azerbaijanis who had been held hostage were released. They were captured on the road between Shusha and Stepanakert by six unidentified people. The fate of an Azerbaijani shepherd and two Armenians remains unknown. Only the fuel tanker in which they were carrying fuel was found.

Military and law enforcement organizations are carrying out a search for the missing.

Representative Appointed to U.S., Canada

PM0908084491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[By S. Bablumyan from IZVESTIYA, TASS, INTERFAX, IAN, REUTERS, UPI roundup: "Armenian Mission in United States Opened"]

[Text] The Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Aleksandr Arzumanyan as Armenian representative in the United States and Canada.

It is clear from the news release issued on the event that the newly appointed representative's duties will include the strengthening of direct ties with Armenian organizations and the Armenian community in the United States and Canada and the coordination of aid to the republic from those countries.

The Armenian representative, who will be a resident of New York, is authorized to present the official view of the republic's parliament and government to various U.S. and Canadian organs, as well as the views of Armenians abroad, IZVESTIYA correspondent S. Bablumyan reports.

Azerbaijan

Group Set Up To Improve Ties With Georgia

NC0908094491 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 6 Aug 91

[Text] In accordance with the instructions of President Ayaz Mutalibov, a permanent working group has been established to prepare for the broadening and strengthening of the economic, scientific, technical, and cultural relations between Azerbaijan and Georgia as called for by the agreement for friendship and good-neighborly relations between the two republics. Rakhim Guseynov, deputy prime minister of the Azerbaijan republic and chairman of the Azerbaijan State Committee for Economic Affairs and Planning, has been elected to head the group which will study bilateral relations, determine the fields in which concrete contacts can be made, and establish the directions of the cooperation the two sides have now and will have in the future in various fields, including the economic and cultural domains.

The group is composed of Ziyad Samed-zade, chairman of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Economic Affairs Commission; Vefa Kulizade, adviser to President Mutalibov; El'dar Salayev, president of the Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences; Aydin Azizbayev, chairman of the Azerbaijan State Committee for (?Material and Technical Supply); Agasalim Bagirov, minister of trade; Akhmed Mustafayev, member of the administrative board of [word indistinct]; Namik Kyamal Aliyev, chairman of the State Committee for Gas Supply; Muzamil Abdullayev, minister of agriculture and food; Polad Byul-Byul Oglu, minister of education; and [word indistinct] Abdullayev, chief of the Azerbaijan railways administration.

Kazakhstan

President Nazarbayev To Visit Kyrgyzstan 9 Aug

OW0808121091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Kazakhstan President Nursultan Nazarbayev comes to Bishkek on Friday on August 9. The ceremony of exchange of the deeds of ratification of the treaty on friendship and cooperation between Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan is expected to be held in the capital of Kyrgyzstan the next day.

Alma-Ata Status, Mayoral Office To Be Defined

PM0808140991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA roundup: "Alma-Ata's Status"]

[Text] A group of specialists has set about elaborating a law on the status of Kazakhstan's capital. The law's concept was approved at a city soviet session.

According to the elaborated concept, republic organizations will start paying the city soviet for the use of its land and the city's services. It has also been decided to scrap the principle of collegial management, which, as practice has showed, allowed personal opinions to be passed off as public opinions. In this connection, a one-man executive and administrative organ in the person of a mayor is being introduced, TASS reports.

Republic Private Trader's Successful Operations

PM0808142391 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 2 Aug 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by D. Baimbetov and G. Shalabayev, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] At its regular June session, the Kazakh parliament adopted a law on destatization and privatization in the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. What practical steps does it involve? Here is a report from our correspondent Dukesh Baimbetov.

[Baimbetov] The people of Kapchagay began to carry out so-called small-scale privatization earlier than other regions. This store, for instance, was acquired by B. Moldakhanov and his family before the law was adopted this January. Since then its monthly commodity turnover has increased five or six times. There is nothing surprising in that. After all, there is a wide range of foodstuffs on the shelves—meat, fish, sausages, dairy and confectionery goods, and plenty of horsemeat delicacies that are particularly prized in Kazakhstan. Incidentally, the store's name "Bereke" means "plenty." They managed to persuade the leaders of two nearby sovkhozes to conclude direct contracts and they have begun to buy surplus agricultural produce from the country people.

Does the purchaser benefit, is it profitable for you? Are you making a profit?

[B.S. Moldakhanov, identified by caption] Of course we are making a profit. We've been in operation for six months now. We've made some profit in this time. With this money we've bought a truck to deliver goods and a vegetable stall.

[Baimbetov] I don't know how things will go for "Bereke." We'll come back in a short while, but today the main question is still: How do you get your hands on goods?

[Moldakhanov] State enterprises and outlets and other enterprises don't want to enter into ties with us. But two enterprises have made concessions—the Kapchagay fishing complex and Alma-Ata's fruit concern—and have concluded a contract with us. But they supply goods at 30 percent more than state stores.

[Baimbetov] The law itself suggests a way out. Along with the privatization of trading enterprises, wholesale bases must also be privatized so that store owners can become shareholders in them. Then the owners of private stores would not have to demean themselves in front of everyone by asking for goods.

Newspaper Reports Further on Republic's Pollution

PM0808153191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA roundup: "Ust-Kamenogorsk's Lamentable Record"]

[Text] Ust-Kamenogorsk has been declared one of the planet's most ecologically unwholesome cities—this conclusion was reached by a USSR Supreme Soviet expert commission after eight months' comprehensive scientific and practical research. USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov has issued a suitable instruction in connection with the extreme ecological situation in East Kazakhstan Oblast. Specifically, the oblast obtains most favored status by allocating for 1992-1993 material and technical resources for the reconstruction and technical retooling of polluter facilities. This year and next year enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Metallurgy and Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry located on the oblast's territory have the right to sell above-plan output for freely convertible foreign currency. The resources gained in this way will go toward making the territory ecologically healthy and radically developing health care, IZVESTIYA own correspondent S. Yeremeyev reports.

Kyrgyzstan

Jurisdiction Over Union Enterprises Takes Effect

LD0908082191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0745 GMT 9 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Bishkek, 9 Aug (TASS)—The decree by Kyrgyz President Askar Akayev on handing Union enterprises over to the jurisdiction of the republic has been published here today. An exception is being made only for those enterprises "...whose work, with the agreement of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, has to ensure Union functions." The document notes that the republic is not removing economic obligations from itself with regard to the center including payments to creditors abroad. The decree proposes to the republic's Cabinet of Ministers that it define the amount that the republic should direct toward clearing off the Union's foreign debt. The document points to the need to "present a proposal on forming a republican gold reserve." At the same time the decree establishes that henceforth on the territory of Kyrgyzstan prospecting for and extraction of useful minerals will be carried out only on the basis of special permits and licences given out by the government of that Central Asian republic. The Kyrgyz president's decree went into effect as of today.

Program To Support Entrepreneurship Drafted

OW0808025991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1330 GMT 7 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Kyrgyzstan State Committee for Demonopolization has drafted a comprehensive program of supporting entrepreneurship which should come into force in that Central Asian republic in the near future.

The program names the spheres where initiative should be promoted first of all. New small business structures are to be formed. Such companies will have advantages in taxation and lending. This concerns primarily small plants opened for the production of food, storing and marketing farm produce and consumer goods as well as travel agencies, sports and fitness centers.

The state committee believes that small and medium-sized companies in these spheres can bring the republic big profits in foreign currency as well as roubles within a very short period of time.

Republic Militia Supports Departyization

OW0808123391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The republican conference of the Kyrgyzstan Interior Forces' employees is scheduled on August 12. The subject of the conference is departyization of militia.

As an "IF" [INTERFAX] correspondent found out 36 from 37 CPSU members in the republican Interior Ministry personnel stand up for complete departyization of the Interior bodies.

Turkmenistan

Horizontal Wells Boost Republic Oil Production

LD0808211791 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 19 Jul 91 p 2

[Summary] Sinking of the second horizontal well to a depth of 3,603 meters has been completed in very difficult mining and geological conditions at the Koturdepe field, one of the largest in Central Asia. Prior to this, the electric drilling team sunk a similar well to a depth of 3,653 meters, with a horizontal termination of the hole; of 145 meters.

"For the first time in the country, Turkmenian oil is being obtained from horizontal arteries situated at such great depth. For over a year, the first well has been yielding five times more oil than is extracted from adjacent vertical ones. According to specialists' calculations, savings from the use of this well alone will amount to some 5 million rubles.

"Taking into account these advantages, we are planning to use this progressive method also in developing other fields in Turkmenia, where sinking of wells by the usual method is being hindered by a dense network of service lines and the complicated relief of the site, S.I. Korotkov, engineer-in-chief of the 'Turkmennneft' association said. Horizontal wells will considerably reduce expenditure on sinking additional vertical holes and will help preserve an ecologically clean environment. They are invaluable in developing fields in the conditions of the rising level of the water in the Caspian and the flooding of some oil recover areas."

'Popular Science' Newspaper Debuts in Republic

LD0808222791 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 24 Jul 91 p 2

[Summary] On 28 June the USSR State Committee for the Press registered the all-union popular science newspaper TURKMENIYA SEGODNYA. It is the first popular science newspaper of such class in the history of the Turkmen periodical press.

TURKMENIYA SEGODNYA is a small format bulletin of the newspaper type, which will appear in four languages: Russian, Turkmen, English and Turkish, with an overall edition of 50,000 copies. In the long term it will also be published in French, German, Persian and Arabic.

This new publication was founded by Turkmen journalist Kamildzhan Kalandarov: "We will try to establish firm contacts with Turkmen compatriots living in our country and also abroad," he said. It will be published by the MOLVA newspaper firm of the journalism faculty of the Lomonosov Moscow State University. It will be printed in Russian, Turkmen and English at the IZVESTIYA publishing house, and in Turkish in Ankara.

Uzbekistan

Republic Reorganizes Publication of Periodicals

LD0808131591 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 25 Jul 91 p 1

[Excerpts] Beginning August 1991, registration starts for newspapers and journals for 1992. This important campaign will take place under the conditions of a major widening of the information market. In line with the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic law "On Means of Mass Information," from July 1991, 308 newspapers and 47 journals are registered in Uzbekistan. [passage omitted]

The 1991 registration campaign will be a test for all newspapers and journals. Prepared for it, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan thoroughly studied the activities of a series of its periodicals. On the basis of an all-around analysis of the situation it was decided to publish the newspapers PRAVDA VOSTOKA and SOVIET OZBEKISTONI five times per week. Beginning in January, 1992, the Uzbek Communist Party [CP] Central Committee newspaper KISHLOK GAKIKAT-I will be published as the newspaper of the Uzbek CP Central Committee and the Uzbek Ministry of Agriculture. The journal of the Uzbek CP Central Committee SANAT will be transferred to the Uzbek Ministry for Culture. The journals MULOKOT and DIALOGUE, due to insufficient financial and other resources and with the aim of reducing expenses for maintaining them, will be published as independent supplements to the journal INSON and SIOSAT—CHELOVEK I POLITIKA. The journal MULOKOT will be renamed ETIKOD and DIALOGUE will be the journal POZITSIYA. [passage omitted]

New Environmental Weekly To Be Published

LD0808111591 Tashkent SOVET OZBEKISTONI in Uzbek 25 Jul 91 p2

[Summary] The Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic State Press Committee is to begin the publication in August of a new weekly called UZBEKISTAN TABIAT-I [Uzbekistan Environment] which will only be published on a monthly basis until the end of this year, then from 1992 on a weekly basis. Initially, 20,000 copies are to be published at a cost of 20 kopecks a copy. The weekly will cover questions related to the environment, its protection, and the prevention of pollution.

Outbreak of Typhoid Reported in Bukhara Region

OW0808141591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1130 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] 77 people diagnosed as suffering from typhoid have been hospitalised in the Kyzyltepinskiy Area of the Bukhara Region. All are residents of the Buston State Farm.

14 people are now in a serious condition and one 33-year-old woman has died. According to details issued by the head sanitary doctor of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the republic's deputy minister of health, T. Iskandorov, all who have fallen ill used water from open reservoirs, since there is no plumbing at the State Farm.

It was revealed that 80 percent of the farm's 19,000 residents drink directly from irrigation ditches or pools contaminated with organic fertilizers.

The local authorities were not alarmed when in 1990 45 farm workers recovered from typhoid. Now, however, at the insistence of the anti-epidemic headquarters, clean water is being delivered to the villages of the state farm and the reservoirs are being disinfected.

END OF FICHE

DATE FILMED

22 Aug. 1991